

# Christian Faith and Life

Combining *The Bible Champion* and *The Essentialist*

Volume 37

OCTOBER, 1931

Number 10

## EDITORIAL

### There are Signs of Promise

IN many parts of the country there is evidence that the ministry are turning with wistful hearts to Almighty God for a new baptism of power. There are two responsible groups, and both of them ably lead in New England, who are praying and working for a revival. What a striking thing it would be if New England the home of Unitarianism should be the first to react from Modernism, and to make a vital Christian faith again effective.

But the eager desire is not confined to New England nor to the clergy alone.

Bishop Arthur Moore of the Methodist Church, South, says that he finds this heart hunger general. In his experience he has seen it more markedly among the laity than the clergy.

Dr. Cadman, speaking of the need for a revival said, the other day:

We must get back to the Sacrifice of Christ for sin and all that that means before the revival we are all hoping and praying for can come. Christianity is not primarily a body of ethics; but it does provide, through Christ's manifestation and redeeming work, the way which men have always sought.

Dr. Cadman knows Modernism, and has unquestionably felt its subtle influence; but he is pressing back behind it to the faith of the ages for the only solution of life.

Bishop McConnell, in spite of the decline of his own Church both financially and numerically, seems still to be fascinated with Modernism's indefiniteness. Recently, he wrote:

There was a general recognition of the riches for the salvation of the world available in Christ Jesus—the problem being to find out how to tap these reservoirs and pour the riches on the world. The commission dealing specifically with the significance of Jesus for the world today attacked directly the question as to how Christ now helps

men. Of course there was presupposed in this the uniqueness of Christ, but no time was wasted in theoretical discussions of that uniqueness. As hardly any two Methodist views fully agree in Christological theory it was positively refreshing to find holders of all shades of such theory agreeing on the indispensability and availability of the Christ resources for the salvation of the world here and now.

Bishop McConnell has a magnificent intellect, and broad learning; but he evidently is not closely in touch with religious life in his day if he thinks the bewildered multitudes are any longer to be interested in an indefinite Christ. The Christ who produced every revival of Church History from Pentecost to now is God the Eternal Son; Who became incarnate for man's salvation; made atonement for our sins in the sacrifice of His Cross; triumphed over our death; and is our supernatural providence at the right hand of God. It will not do simply to affirm Him unique. It will not do simply to be sure that in some way He is the solution. We must know how and why He is unique. We must know in what way He is the solution, and how the solution which is in Him is available for us. Certainly Christianity must be a social leaven; but primarily it must be a vital, almighty salvation for lost, defeated, guilty individual men. The day of Modernism's indefiniteness is done. It has produced its fruitage: a bewildered world and a declining Church. It is time for real intelligent faith and flaming passion to build again the one great foundation: Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever. To build this foundation and press its sublime significance on man's weary heart is the one solution, the only answer to our desperate human need. O Christ help us to be able to receive the Revival which thou art ready to work—through faith.—H. P. S.



# The Man who Found His Soul

WILLIAM L. STIDGER, D.D.

There was a man who lost his soul  
 Along a lonely way;  
 There was a man who lost his soul  
 Upon a tragic day.  
 For years he walked in light and love  
 And joy was in his life;  
 He knew the star-lit skies above  
 Amid Time's pain and strife.  
 Within him was a sense of Peace;  
 He knew what calm could be;  
 His soul had found the great release,  
 Had known its ecstasy.  
 But life had battered him about  
 And beaten down his dream.  
 Then darkness settled on his path  
 Without a hope or gleam.  
 He had so many things to do,  
 So many wheels to turn;  
 So swift the fleeting minutes flew;  
 So much to see and learn,  
 He quite forgot Eternal things  
 Along the path he trod;  
 He lost his way, he lost his hope;  
 He lost his Guide and God!

He turned and traced his footsteps back  
 To where he's started from;  
 He took the same old beaten track  
 From whence he once had come.  
 He knew along that very way,  
 Along that beaten sod  
 He once had known a happy day  
 Where he had found his God.  
 He knew there was an Altar Place,  
 A spire, and church, and dream,  
 Where he, in highest hope and grace  
 Had caught a wistful gleam.  
 He knew that there had been a light  
 To penetrate the gloom;  
 He knew there was a vision bright  
 Within an Upper Room.  
 He knew a boyhood home and shrine  
 Where God had come to him;  
 So long ago with light, Divine  
 Mid vesper shadows, dim;  
 A little church upon a hill,  
 A quaint old organ there;  
 A solemn hush; a moment, still  
 With love and song and prayer,  
 When he had found the beauty,  
 Of ecstasy and peace  
 Which comes to any man or maid  
 Who finds, The Great Release.

He turned again to Pentecost  
 And to an Upper Room  
 To find the "Spirit" he had lost  
 Along the path of gloom.  
 He gathered with a faithful few

Who still had kept the dream  
 And found the fire was burning high  
 With no uncertain gleam.  
 He found the cloven tongues alight;  
 The voices, strange and strong;  
 Undying voices in the night  
 Of laughter, love and song,  
 He felt a rushing, mighty wind  
 Blow through the soul of him;  
 A comradeship of kin and kind;  
 His eyes with tears, grew dim.  
 He made the Great Surrender  
 He once had made of old;  
 His heart was tense and tender  
 When memories unrolled.

And all his new world marvelled  
 At what had come to him  
 For they could hear the singing  
 Of some great hope and hymn.  
 They felt it in his kindness,  
 They heard it in his voice;  
 They knew that he had made, anon  
 Some vast and solemn choice.  
 They knew, because he loved them,  
 And made them feel it so.  
 They knew, because his countenance  
 Began to shine and glow.  
 They knew, because he served them  
 With wistfulness and joy;  
 Because there was, within that love  
 No tincture of alloy.  
 There was a light about him,  
 A wistful, living light  
 Which turned to day and dawning  
 The gloom of any night.  
 There was a touch of pity  
 And sympathy, forsooth  
 For Sinner, Saint, and Sufferer;  
 For man, and maid, and youth.  
 They saw it in his gestures  
 And heard it in his song;  
 They felt it in his presence  
 Amid life's surging throng.  
 They knew that he had found it—  
 Which had been lost so long.  
 They knew that he had turned about  
 Upon a leaden day;  
 That he had found his soul again  
 On some Damascus Way.  
 They knew that he had visioned  
 A Paradise Sublime;  
 They sensed that he was riding on  
 The crest of Tide and Time.  
 They knew what he had sought for  
 In Pentecost, profound;  
 They knew his quest was ended;  
 That what was lost was found.



## How the next Revival will come

THE primary responsibility of the Church is evangelism. This used to be universally admitted. It is even yet today most widely admitted. Nevertheless we seem quite generally to have lost the technique, and in part also the passion for this toil. We must recover these things. It is imperative for our own souls. It is imperative for the souls of men. It is imperative for our civilization.

In the eighteenth century England had a revival issuing in an effective political reconstruction, while France had a bloody, a hideous revolution. The world has its choice between these two again today; and which develops depends upon whether leadership in the next decades is Christian, or secular. Christianity is the only revolutionary force the energy of which is love. Revolutions energized by ungodly men are always upheavals of hate. The progress of civilization demands the development of economically equalizing forces. It demands the deliverance of the entire population from the bitterness of poverty and from economic fear. There can be no failure. There can be no excuse; but if atheism leads the way it will be a holocaust. If a Christ-inspired and energized Church leads the way it will be grace, brotherhood, exaltation.

This is the question that is being settled today all over America in the parsonages of ten thousand Churches. God has a plan for a Christ-believing civilization. Shall we as individuals, and we as the Republic walk in that plan? Shall ten thousand ministers from the Atlantic to the Pacific lead their people back to faith and prayer and Christward expectation; back to repentance and justification and inner Christian certainty? Shall we? Do we know how? Are we Christian enough to do this thing?

But, says some one, "I do not believe in revivals." Perhaps you have never experienced their power? Perhaps your disbelief in revivals rises in a fundamental defect in you? It is possible. Wesley found that it was true in his own case. He failed because he had never experienced. He was an ethical follower of Jesus who knew nothing of the passion and power of effective relationship to his crucified and risen Saviour by faith and the Holy Ghost. When he had experienced that vital contact he preached with

new power, certainty and effectiveness. O, this is what we need! This is the only solution for our confusion and halting.

For decades now one ringing cry of "Forward" after another has been echoing through the Church. We have been running hither and yon without much knowledge as to which way we were going. We have just been rushing, rushing, rushing. Sometimes one fears that, just because it was motion, retreat has been taken for progress. Sometimes our vast activity has been in fact only a beating of the air; but now the crisis is upon us. All along the battle line the conquering Christ of the Ages points the advance. Every Church is a regiment. Every preacher is a captain. The heroes of the centuries watch our toil. They bled. They burned. They were faithful. They related men to Jesus Christ. They lifted civilization. They built the ageless glory,—the Kingdom of His Eternal Purpose. The Christ who led them leads us. "Forward!" He calls.

"Forward!" It is not a quota. It is the soul of a preacher; it is the soul of a Church advancing to grips with individual sin and helplessness. It is the mind and heart of a preacher and the mind and heart of a Church eagerly witnessing Christ; Christ crucified and risen again; Christ the Redeemer of our guilt, the Regenerator of our impotency.

"Forward!" It is not a program. There will be a thousand programs. There will be as many different programs as there are preachers and Churches attacking the problem of sin; but there will be only one Gospel, the Gospel that unites the grace of measureless love, with the searching moral demand of judgment, and the creative power of the Infinite God. This is the Gospel, no matter what the program; and it cannot fail.

"Forward!" Christ makes His advances through you and me. It may not be you. It may not be I; but it must be some one if Christ's holy cause is to advance in this our day.

As a preparation for writing these words the editor of *CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE* addressed some twenty-six Christian leaders of all denominations in the Republic, asking each one to send in the five most important suggestions which he could offer to a young minister seeking to promote a revival of religion. Nearly every one of those addressed



replied immediately. We are presenting here a list of those brethren as an acknowledgment of their interest. They were:

Dr. J. W. Able of Kansas; Dr. J. Whitcomb Brounger of Boston; Bishop Edgar Blake of Indianapolis; Dr. Frederick Eiselen of Chicago; Dr. Charles L. Goodell of New York; Dr. I. M. Hargett of Tulsa; Bishop Adna Leonard of Buffalo; Bishop F. D. Leete of Omaha; Dr. H. C. Maitland of Pennsylvania; Bishop Arthur J. Moore of Los Angeles; Dr. Robert Schuler of Los Angeles; Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins of Philadelphia; Dr. S. H. Turbeville of Kansas; Dr. Lewis L. Akers of Kentucky; Dr. Henry W. Bromley of Kentucky; Bishop Warren A. Candler of Atlanta; Dr. Loren Edwards of Denver; Dr. Carlisle Hubbard of Chicago; Dr. I. D. Harris; Dr. John Langdale of New York; Dr. Clarence E. Macartney of Pittsburgh; Dr. J. C. McPheeters of San Francisco; Dr. A. S. Smith of Nashville; Dr. R. L. Stewart of Indiana; Dr. S. Ladd Thomas of Philadelphia; Dr. Robert C. Wells of Philadelphia.

Every letter received disclosed an earnest sense of the need for reality, if evangelism is to be more than an empty form. Perhaps the most impressive of the several responses was that of Bishop Adna Leonard, of Buffalo, New York. We are publishing his letter in full. He said:

First, it is imperative that the preacher himself shall know Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour from sin.

Second, he should possess a working knowledge of and belief in the Bible as the inspired Word of God.

Third, he should have a Christ-like appreciation of the value and worth of the individual.

Fourth, he should cultivate the lost art of intercessory prayer and actually pay the price of spiritual leadership.

Fifth, he should rely upon the Holy Spirit for guidance and for the illumination of mind and heart in dealing with the complex moral problems of the day.

#### THE PREACHER MUST PREPARE HIS OWN HEART

One idea runs through all the answers. It is that the preacher must prepare his own heart, if he is to be the avenue of divine approach in a spiritual quickening upon his Church.

He must prepare his heart by communion with God in prayer.

He must prepare his heart by a study of the Scriptures, giving particular attention to their emphasis upon the Person of Christ,

His pre-existence, Creatorhood, His eternal glory, the sacrifice of His incarnation and redemptive cross; making the climax of his study the glorious truth of His historical resurrection and triumph for us all.

He must prepare his heart also by the study of the Scripture truth concerning sin giving attention especially to the ruinous results of sin; first, in time, and second, in eternity. Dr. Carlisle Hubbard, and Dr. S. H. Turbeville both of whom are successful evangelistic preachers bring these most helpful suggestive details with respect to the preparation of the preacher's heart.

He must prepare his heart by the exercising of his own faith, appropriating Jesus' promise that the Comforter will guide and illuminate us in all our exploration of His precious truth. Study and pray together. He must make his study a spiritual devotion as well as an intellectual effort. He must seek from God the privilege of feeling the compassion of Christ for sinful men. Bishops A. Leonard and W. A. Candler both stress this important preparation item; but every one who answered the question agreed that the preparation of the preacher's own heart was the prime necessity of a real revival. Evangelism can only be real when it is led by a man whose own heart is really aflame.

#### A GROUP WITHIN HIS CHURCH TO FELLOWSHIP IN PRAYER

The second most sustained emphasis throughout the answers to the questionnaire was that the preacher should surround himself with a group of leaders, or even of private individuals within the Church, who will fellowship with him in prayer for an outpouring of God's spirit. Bishop Frederick D. Leete, of Omaha, Nebraska, Dr. H. C. Maitland, an evangelist in Kansas, and Dr. I. M. Hargett, of Tulsa, Oklahoma, all three stress the importance of relating the officials of the Church to this prayer effort. Dr. Hubbard, of Oak Park, Illinois, suggests that along with prayer this group shall study, seeking to make themselves more effective as personal workers. President Eiselen of Garrett, Chicago, stresses the importance of the full consecration of every member of this inner group. Bishop Adna W. Leonard does not mention the group, but urges that the preacher himself shall engage earnestly in intercessory prayer. Dr. Hubbard and Dr. Whitcomb Brounger, of Boston add also the



detail of prayer lists.

This group emphasis is of very great importance. We are not simply individuals, we are a solidarity. Jesus made definite promises concerning our united prayers. He said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst." He also said, in the same context, "If two of you shall agree as touching anything, it shall be given unto you of my Father." It is God's will that we should minister unto each other in the things of faith; that faith should stimulate faith, and prayer should strengthen prayer. There is a power in fellowship both inherent and also divinely quickened. Not only as individuals but also in the solidarity of Christian brotherhood must we come. God is waiting for His Church to claim the blessing that He is eager to give.

#### THE CONTENT OF EVANGELISTIC PREACHING

The third subject upon which there is considerable agreement among those answering the questionnaire is as to the subject matter necessary in effective evangelistic preaching. Bishop Leete calls for a preaching of both the law and the gospel. Dr. Hubbard emphasizes the need of preaching the ruin of sin and the all sufficiency of the full orbed Christ of the New Testament. Dr. Turbeville calls for a preaching of "redemption and salvation through Jesus Christ according to the teaching of the Bible, as the only remedy for a race ruined by sin." Dr. Alfred F. Smith of the *Nashville Christian Advocate* and Bishop Candler also bring the same emphasis. Dr. John Langdale of New York emphasizes the importance of getting into expression the reality of regeneration as a life transforming experience. Dr. Goodell of the Federal Council Department of Evangelism turns the preacher back to the Bible for his evangelistic truth, and warns him that where he preaches it must be with his soul bathed by prayer.

#### VISITATION AND PASTORAL LABOR

Dr. R. C. Wells, and Dr. Floyd W. Tomkins of Philadelphia, with Bishop Leete, emphasize the necessity of pastoral visitation with instruction and exhortation in the homes. Dr. Goodell always made use of this approach to men in his own campaigns, though he did not include it in his list of the five most important considerations.

#### A THOROUGHLY PLANNED MEETING

Dr. Brougher says: "Carefully plan an evangelistic campaign, with meetings every night." "Prepare thoroughly your services," says Dr. Wells. Dr. Hubbard is more emphatic. He says, Be careful in "planning for the actual conducting of the meetings including time, place, committees for publicity, care for the people when they arrive at the Church, music, and every detail."

#### SCATTERED SUGGESTIONS

In addition to the above major items there were scattered suggestions as follows: Read the first two chapters of the Acts, says one effective evangelistic pastor. Get the note of joy and love and victory into your meetings, says another. "Hold on," advises Dr. Smith. "Advertise the services freely, but without exaggeration," advises Dr. Tomkins. "Believe in the power of God, the certainty of victory and seek to reach your Church first," writes a preacher whose own ministry has been one long evangelistic success. Dr. Maitland, a most effective evangelist, urges the organization of two choir groups, one of adults and the other of young people. Drs. Maitland and Goodell both urge the importance of thoroughly prepared constituency lists. Dr. Tomkins urges that the preacher should have a daily hour, during the meetings, when he will meet with Christian men and women to teach them concerning growth in grace.

Dr. William Stidger, Professor of Homiletics at Boston University, said to this writer one day as we sat together at the University: "The Church must get back to a real supernatural experience. I believe in the real Incarnation, the real Atonement, the real Resurrection and a real experience of salvation by faith in this real Christ. The Gospel works in the west and it works in New England. If we turn away from it we get nowhere. When we make use of it there is always power."

What Professor Stidger says is true. The Gospel of Jesus Christ always works. It has been working all the time we have been trying other things. While some men have been trying human wisdom; failing; concluding the day of revivals to be past, other men have been rejoicing in precious works of grace. Unbelief is first a negative idea, then a despair; but finally it is a desolation. So also is Christ. He is first a faith, then an



experience; but finally He is an exaltation and a victory.

The whole world has been and is waiting for this exaltation and victory. It has had too much of negation and doubt and depression. It needs Christ; but it can only get Him through the inflamed, passionate faith of the Church and its consecrated ministry. It is a momentous hour. A new age is in the borning. It can be Christian. It can be pagan. It is with the Church of today to say what the world of tomorrow will be. "Forward!" cries the all-conquering Christ. Who hears His call? Who follows in His train?

#### SUMMARY OF THE SUGGESTIONS

(1) The preacher must prepare his own heart and mind by a study of Biblical truth concerning Christ and His almighty salvation.

(2) The preacher must surround himself with a fellowship of believing prayer, preferably of his officers.

(3) The preacher must preach the ruin of sin and the all-sufficiency of salvation in Christ.

(4) The preacher must carry his Gospel into the homes.

(5) The preacher must carefully prepare his meetings in all details.

(6) The note of joy, love and victory

must be gotten into the meetings.

(7) Prayer lists and constituency lists are suggested.

(8) A provision for the training of Christians in the higher things of the Spirit is essential to a fully organized plan.

(9) The altar, the inquiry room and the smaller after meeting for seekers have all been used as effective means of relating souls immediately to God. Which method is used is not important; but that some method be used is of the utmost importance. The Church must lead men to expect a definite contact with God. Repentance itself brings a temporary relief, which some have mistaken for the experience of inner illumination. The Church must lead men to wait in the divine presence expectantly.

There is reality in Christian experience. There is an immediate awareness of God and Christ that is creative in life. It is not emotion; but the spring and cause of emotion. The infinite God breaks through the clouds of sin and doubt that have hidden Him; we know and are new men. Pentecost is a fact. The speculations of psychology about it are not significant; but the fact that Christian preaching has produced it and is still producing it is significant. We hold it is the preacher's challenge and also his opportunity.—H. P. S.

## A Crisis has Come

THE whole round of our church activity, at home and abroad, has been pervaded by humanistic teaching and the Pelagian conception of salvation as a work in which we proudly share. The gospel we have preached has certainly been a gospel of Energy and Works. Our watchword has been "The Service of Humanity," or "the Kingdom of God," an evolutionary idealism bearing little resemblance to Christ's own teaching on the Kingdom. The "tasks of the Kingdom" have been loudly proclaimed. I suppose there never was a time when there was so much church activity. There has been much fuss, but less faith; much work, but less waiting; much belief in man, but less belief in God.

But enough. There are mounting signs that this "too comfortable" theology, which voids Christianity of some of its fundamental truths, such as sin and grace, which obscures the deity of Christ, is on its death-

bed. It has not been without its contribution to Christian faith, in its emphasis on the human Jesus, but its work is done. If Christ is divine, then I rejoice to know that He is so human. But if He was not divine, what difference can it make to me how human He was.

A crisis has been reached in our theology and in our preaching. Once more we preachers are faced with the question with which Christ faced His disciples: "Whom say ye that I am?" not as a question on which we preach to others, but as a question which Christ puts to ourselves, and sets us thereby in a crisis. Is He no more than the greatest personality thrown up by history, the highest wave tossed up thus far by the sea of humanity; or is He One who has come from beyond to be the Way, the Truth, the Life?

Bound up with it is the other question. What are we to think of God? Are we to think of Him as a Divine Over-Soul, who is



no other than our better self, or is He Another, who stands over against us, and challenges us, and forces us to a decision? There is no way past this challenge for the preacher and for the Church today. And there will be no Forward Movement to speak of unless it passes through the gateway of that critical question.—*The Rev. McConachie in New York Christian Advocate, July 30, 1931, from the Scots Observer.*

This Scotch comment puts its finger upon the nerve center of the Christian discussion. If Jesus Christ was only the noblest of men, he is of but trifling significance for religion, no matter how noble he may have been. If Jesus Christ was only the noblest of men the Church has no Gospel, and its significance is done. But if Jesus Christ is God the eternal Son become incarnate by a stupendous miracle for man's redemption,—then the Church, as the witness of this truth, is the most significant institution in the ages. The effort to avoid this clear issue is as futile as the ostrich's proverbial effort to conceal himself by hiding his head in the sand. The fact is, he who holds that the issue of Christ's person does not matter is already a denier: for no one who truly be-

lieves the Incarnation could see it as insignificant. The master question of the ages is not relativity or evolution but the person of Christ. Was Nicaea right when it affirmed, in unity with the first Christian witnesses, that Jesus of Nazareth was virgin born and risen from the dead, being in fact very and eternal God of one substance and eternity with God the Father; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was made man? If Nicaea was right the world has a gospel, and the Church a mission. If Nicaea was wrong everything is both different and uncertain. The settlement of this question is fundamental to all Christian interests. Whether it be missions or evangelism or the Kingdom of God on earth, or the hope of eternal life in heaven every Christian interest and ministry waits for men and women of this generation to decide how they will think concerning this one isolate, sublime Personality. The creative ages have called Him God and gone forward. A recurring Unitarianism has called Him only man and dies of the littleness of its faith,—“What think ye of Christ, whose Son is He?”

## The Next Revival

THE next revival is fully due. The world is moving steadily to a crisis for which no human wisdom is sufficient. It is the Christ of the Ages or confusion.

Mighty truths certifying Christ are coming in to support faith from every field of human investigation. Archaeology confirms Scripture and challenges Criticism. Physics makes the crude mechanistic ideas of the past decades impossible. The weary hearts of men are turning back from the futility of their boasted wisdom, which by the test of life is proven so unwise.

Sin abounds, sickening, blighting, destructive sin. Neither psychology nor education can cure it. The Incarnate, Crucified, Risen and Ascended Christ is alone sufficient for our needs. The day of revival is at hand. It is time to sing it, to preach it, to pray for power to be effective in it.

We must repent of our sins. We must repent of our proud self-sufficiency and unbelief. We must preach the full orbed Christ, who is still the power of God unto salvation through simple faith.

Awake O Church of God! Put on thy strength and in Christ's name conquer.

### Extra Money

The CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE needs more men and women everywhere as representatives of this magazine. Experience not necessary. You can make profitable use of your spare time. Send a postal today for complete information of our offer to representatives.



## Mistakes of the Mighty

FOR the purpose of this article, I would define a mistake as an error in opinion, judgment, and action. The mighty are those people of unusual ability, great dignity and elevation of position, and wonderful opportunity either for the weal or woe of these that they influence.

Professor Harry Elmer Barnes several times, during the past year, has been quite prominently before the country, in magazine articles and on the platform. He is the loud-speaker of a certain type of unbelief. Because of this he is the popular idol of those "who pride themselves on their ability to think." One of his last exploits, the tendency of which is to undermine Christian Faith in the minds of students, occurred at Dartmouth College, only a few weeks ago.

In this lecture he said: "You can't prove that there is a God any more than you can prove that there is not a God. It is just as logical to found an atheistic society upon a college campus as to have a Christian association."

For many decades past the mechanistic conception of the universe has dominated thought. According to this theory the universe is a machine. Everything in it, including our race, are but cogs in the wheels of the machine. It is self running, they assumed, though they could not prove it. Because of their assumption that the machine is self-running, they assert that there is no need for a God, and therefore sometimes without politeness, they bow God out of His universe.

Apparently, right here is where Professor Barnes lives. He is static and living in the past. He does not know, appears to be totally ignorant of the fact that a new day in science is blazing its new light upon us, and that the Mechanistic Dynasty is dethroned. Today it is principally those, who rummage in the junk heap of dead scientific theories, selecting what they have affinity for, who affirm there is no evidence for the existence of God. Most all the Great High Priests of Science, most all the world renowned physicists, like Planck of Germany, Sir J. J. Thompson of Scotland, Sir Ernest Rutherford, Einstein, Eddington, Millikan and Jeans, have found an ever increasing amount of phenomena which can not be fitted into the mechanistic theory of the universe, and

most of them are finding evidence that God lives.

Since Professor Jeans of Oxford University has so recently been in this country, lecturing before many scientific associations, I will quote him as an example of the Godward trend in science, among the most eminent scientists of the world. In his great book, *The Mysterious Universe*, in the chapter, "Matter and Radiation," Professor Jeans writes: "These concepts reduce the whole universe to a world of light, potential or existent, so that the whole story of its creation (remember he says creation) can be told with perfect accuracy and completeness in six words: 'God said, 'Let there be Light.' Again he speaks of "Substantial matter resolving itself into a creation and manifestation of mind."

This too is from his pen: "The universe can be best pictured . . . as consisting of pure thought . . . for want of a wider word, we must describe as a mathematical thinker." And "If the universe is a universe of thought, its creation must have been an act of thought." In the above quotations Professor Jeans, one of the half dozen foremost scientists of the world, and an original investigator, not a retailer of discarded theories, finds evidence in the universe that God lives.

Our own Professor Millikan, discoverer of the electron, lecturing before an association of scientists, finds evidence of God. In this address he is reported to have said that, away out in space new atoms appeared to be created, to make up for the constant breaking down of existing atoms, and added these significant words: "What is this but an experimental finger pointing to a Creator still on the job."

Here is another foremost scientist of the world who finds evidence that there is a God. It is a great mistake for Professor Barnes to remain ignorant of all this, and much more like it that can be given. Because he lacks up to date information, he made the mistake of saying that there is no evidence that there is a God. And those who believe his mistaken statements will make the greatest mistake possible.

The college paper, *The Dartmouth*, reporting his address said that Barnes "Ques-



tioned the existence of Jesus, stating that there is not as much authoritative information about the entire life and career of Christ as there was printed in a single issue of the *New York Times* regarding the Lindbergh-Morrow marriage." How perfectly annihilating this is to Jesus for any one uninformed, and who does not think.

But the critical battle for the existence of Jesus was long ago fought to final victory, and in favor of the historical position. Here again Professor Barnes lacks up to date information. He is static. He lives several decades back in the past.

Moreover, in the above quoted sentence, he apparently seems to think that bulk is the deciding factor in evidence. The folly of this is exposed when you take it into court, and apply it to judicial procedure. It proves too much for Barnes, for by his own rule of bulky evidence, he would have to make non-existent Plato, Caesar, and many other characters of the past, since the evidence for their historical existence is not bulky.

His rule of bulky evidence is a great mistake. If accused of crime, he would not want to be compelled to produce bulky evidence of his innocence or stand guilty. But the evidence of the historicity of Jesus is bulky. There is, in short, the entire New Testament, the post Apostolic Fathers' literature, all the Christian Churches of today, (for it is impossible to account for their existence except on the ground of the existence of Jesus), the Holy Communion, observed from the time of Christ's death, also the Christmas and Easter observation, and how much more?

Even the Latin historian Tacitus wrote of Christ and so does Josephus. What a mistake for Professor Barnes to discourse on a subject about which he evidently has so little information.

He also said: "Jesus as a teacher of ethics and morals cannot be compared with Plato, who lived five centuries before him." It seems to be a waste of time to notice such senseless remarks as this; but as long as the faith of young people is imperilled by it, the twaddle must be exposed. Plato's ethics were egoistic, as all ancient pagan ethics were.

It is a commonplace of today that Christ's ethics are behind all the social advance since His day. His ethics dignified every human being. He saw all men as created in the image of God. He elevated womanhood, liberated slaves, ennobled labor, and now is moving to

abolish war. Compare this with Plato's accomplishments. Just for one moment try to fancy Plato making a proposition to the nations to help Germany, out of the financial and revolutionary bog in which she was almost hopelessly sinking. But the Christ inspired soul of President Hoover has done so.

Mr. Will Durant, author of *The Story of Philosophy* and *Mansion of Philosophy*, by many will be accorded a place with the mighty. But he, too, like some others, makes mighty mistakes. On page 565 of the latter book he wrote: "The Reformation caused the Inquisition." This is evidently prejudiced writing. The facts are the Inquisition was introduced in France in 1184, in Italy in 1235, Germany in 1231, and reached its worst stage in Spain near the close of the fifteenth century; while the Reformation did not open until the sixteenth century. Just such absurd statements by some of the Mighty, ought to lead people to think through other of their statements antagonistic to the Christian religion and to keep a question mark against them until they do.

Another mistake Durant makes is to give fifty-one pages to Nietzsche, fifty-four to Schopenhauer (both atheists) and fifty-six to Voltaire, while he does not give a single line to such outstanding Christian philosophers as Sir William Hamilton, George T. Ladd, and Borden P. Bowne. Was this mistake intentional? Was it fair to ignore such widely recognized philosophical thinkers? The animus or prejudice of an author ought to be noted. It oftentimes occasions some of his mighty mistakes.

Dr. S. G. Cole, a professor of Religious Education in Crozier Theological Seminary, is another one of the Mighty. He is the author of the book, *The History of Fundamentalism*. He gives twenty-nine pages to fundamentalism in the Methodist Episcopal Church and to Dr. Harold Paul Sloan's outstanding leadership of it. The indispensable requisites of an historian are to accumulate all the historical facts, accurately to state them, and judicially to interpret them. It is a matter of deep regret that Dr. Cole has quite failed in all three of these requisites. It is an almost unpardonable mistake thus to fail when the interests of a great man and a great church are involved. What is the evidence of his failure? It will be found in detail, in the editorial, "The Peril of Prejudiced Scholarship," in the August issue of this magazine.



I will condense these mistakes in the following sentence. He has made about twenty-five misstatements in about twenty-nine pages, almost entirely against fundamentalism, or the orthodox position in Methodism, and against Dr. Sloan, the leader. This is absolutely inexcusable for he was dealing with the facts of current history, easily accessible. But it seems that, instead of consulting historical records, he has spun his so-called historical facts out of his prejudiced mind, just as a spider does its web out of its own body. How else can you account for about twenty-five misstatements in twenty-nine pages, and all of them to the detriment of the fundamentalist group, or its leader? Is this a sample of his work in the class room before students? If so, shades of Neander and all other truthful Church Historians, have mercy on and deliver the students.

Further evidence of the startling unreliability, in the statement of what they allege to be facts, can be found in a sermon preached in New York in the recent past, by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick on the subject, "The Peril of Worshipping Jesus." In order to show that the worship of Jesus tends to ethical insensitiveness, he cites two men as examples. He affirms that John Newton, who wrote the hymn: "How Sweet the Name of Jesus Sounds," was also running a slave ship from Africa to the slave markets. The implication is that he could be a worshipper of Jesus and yet actively participate in the horrors of the African slave trade. What are the real facts in this Newton case? When about twenty-five years old, Newton was a master of a slave ship, and continued to be till he was thirty. He was a young Christian during these five years. He suffered confusion of conscience because of his slave trading, and finally, when he was about thirty years old, gave up the sea and the traffic. Nineteen years later he wrote the hymn: "How Sweet the Name of Jesus Sounds." The worship of Jesus in part constrained Newton to give up slaving. The worship of Jesus thus had the very opposite effect from that which Dr. Fosdick alleges. This misrepresentation of Newton is a grave injustice

to a dead man, who cannot defend himself.

In this same sermon the preacher also misstates the facts as to the life of Sir John Bowring. He says he, the author of the hymn, "In the Cross of Christ I Glory," was the agent of the British Empire in forcing opium on China. What are the real facts? First, Bowring wrote his hymns when a young man in his early thirties. Twenty-eight years after his hymn writing he became Governor of Hongkong. What an injustice to Bowring it is to create the impression that he was a Christian hymn writer and the agent of England in forcing opium on China at the same time! The fact is there were twenty-eight years between the writing and the agency.

But again, it is not true to say that Sir John Bowring was England's agent when opium was forced on China, for the first war, which opened Chinese ports to English commerce, was over before Bowring went out; and the second war was not over opium but over the honor of the British flag which had been violated by a Chinese official. During this second Bowring was not England's ranking statesman in China but was under the orders of his superior.

But more serious still, from the point of view of the accuracy of Dr. Fosdick is the fact that Sir John Bowring was not a worshipper of Jesus in the Christian sense. He was, like Dr. Fosdick himself, a Unitarian (the detailed account of these incidents are given by Dr. Sloan in his editorial "Is There Peril in the Worship of Jesus?" in the May issue of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE).

The mistakes which I have listed above are all of them concerned with scholarship. They represent either careless information or else, as the editor of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE says, "prejudiced scholarship." It is time Christian men and women took warning and made it a fixed intellectual policy to reject all criticisms of Christian truth, and of Scripture until they have been definitely verified: for it is quite evident that many of those who promulgate critical and destructive opinions cannot be depended upon carefully to develop their facts.

—G. H. N.

**DID YOU SEE** that Hymn of expectancy toward a Revival entitled "His Day of Power will Come" on the third page? Look it up!



# Comments on Topics of the Times

## A Definition of the Bible

In a lecture the other day the writer formulated a definition of the Bible. He would be glad to know what other people think of it; whether they deem it adequate; whether it covers the ground, or whether something should be added to it to make it complete. Here it is: The Bible is the divinely inspired volume in which God has revealed to mankind the truths which make for their highest well-being here and hereafter, and which He has not revealed to them otherwise, and which they could not have discovered by their own reason and research.

## A Bishop's Strange Question

Some time ago Bishop McConnell sent out a questionnaire. One of the questions referred to the virgin birth of Christ. The form of the question was this: whether it is true that "one who doubts the virgin birth of Christ cannot accept Him as a divine Saviour." To our way of thinking, that is a strange question for a bishop of the church to ask, for surely a bishop should be a theologian and a scholar. Let us probe into the doctrine of the virgin birth once more, as we have so often done before in these columns. If Christ had been conceived and born by natural generation, He would have been a purely human person. That is always the result of natural procreation. Then how could Christ have been "a divine Saviour?" To repeat, could a human person, humanly generated, have been divine? On the other hand, take the true doctrine: If the divine person of the Son of God was creatively enfolded and ensphered in human nature by the action of the Holy Spirit, then He was truly divine in person and yet was incarnate in human nature. Is not that plain? Only so could He be the divine Saviour. There must be better thinking on the part of the Modernists in order to pass as real theologians.

## The Virgin Birth a Creative Act

An eminent German theologian speaks of the virgin birth of our Lord as a divinely creative act. That is what it was. It was accomplished by the creative power of the Holy Spirit in the procreative being of the blessed virgin. The Holy Spirit by a divine and holy process fashioned a portion of human nature—and true, pristine human na-

ture it was—and enshrined in it the divine self-consciousness of the Son of God, so that He had real human experience and at the same time did not surrender His divine nature, except that He did not always exercise His divine power and exhibit His divine glory, but humbled Himself and became obedient unto the death of the cross. This statement, that the virgin conception was a divine creative act, relieves the doctrine of all those elements of passion and coarseness and lust that characterize the pagan instances of supposed supernatural births.

## An Unconvincing Presentment

We have read with care an article on "How Man Was Created" in *Popular Science Monthly* for June. It consists of an interview with Dr. William K. Gregory, of the American Museum of Natural History. To our mind, the article is entirely unconvincing. It is a notable case of begging the question. The theory of evolution is simply taken for granted, and then the process is described and illustrated with a profusion of pictures. In one of them Dr. Gregory is pointing to a picture of the rise of man from the fishes through a graduated series of other animals. Among the creatures antecedent and ancestral to man are an alligator, a polar bear, a lemur, an ape, a gorilla, and a creature half-human carrying a club on his shoulder. This pictured presentment seems to convince Dr. Gregory that man came into being along the evolutionary route. However, there is one salient fact that nullifies the whole presentation; and that is, that not one of the creatures of the whole series has ever been known to procreate any other kind of offspring than its own distinct type. Take the case of the polar bear—has it ever been known to breed anything but polar bears? Moreover, of the millions of intermediate forms that must have existed some time, if evolution is true, not one is shown in this more or less bizarre picture. Thus there are myriads of missing links in the evolutionary chain; and their outstanding characteristic is that they are *missing*.

## More Inconsistency

The enterprising editor of *Popular Science Monthly* is a past-master in the art of advertising. He says, "You will be thrilled by the



new and startling statements Dr. Gregory here passes on to you, backed by the weight of his years of study and reputation." We confess that, to our way of thinking, Dr. Gregory's statements are neither new nor startling. They have often been presented in books on evolution. The story is put in dialogue form, and is evidently an interview which a reporter held with the noted scientist. On this account a good deal of space is wasted by the reporter's rather inane questions. A straightforward recital would save the reader a good deal of time. Moreover, the editor announces this article as the "first of a series of articles that explain 'life—the world's greatest mystery.'" But if life is "the world's greatest mystery," how can it be "explained?" Then, again, is life the greatest mystery in the world? Is not even dead matter itself just as profound a mystery? And what about electricity, time, space, mind? Nobody knows just what the ultimate essence of things is. We know phenomena. The *noumena* we do not know.

### A Sample of Dogmatism

Near the beginning of the article above referred to, Dr. Gregory said that scientists must have evidence, and that they have "plenty of evidence to prove that man was created, or that he evolved—the choice of words is a matter of individual opinion—by extremely slow stages over a period of more than a billion years." Then he turned to his interviewer and asked, "Have you any idea of what a billion years means?" Mr. Mok replied, "I have not." Quoth Dr. Gregory, "Neither have I. Nobody has." Here is an almost *naïve* mixture of assertion and concession. We believe that the concession cancels the assertion. If "figures like that stagger the imagination" (the quotation is from Dr. Gregory), how can scientists figure out that man has been evolving more than a billion years? It does seem that the speculative scientists are adepts at manipulating big figures that "stagger the imagination." In the foregoing statement, too, Dr. Gregory misuses the term "created" by making it a synonym of "evolved." If man was evolved, then he could not have been created, for the two terms have a different meaning. To create means to bring something into existence that had no prior existence. To evolve means to develop something that already exists, however it may have come into existence. Many scientists confuse the issue by the misuse of common terms.

### As to the Origin of Life

"Nobody, of course, really knows." So said Dr. Gregory. Further on, he gives his guess. Scientists now generally believe, he says, that life was produced by chemical forces that had been at work for thousands of centuries. . . . It took these chemical forces about half a billion years to build up the raw materials of living matter. Chemical combinations were formed that became more and more complex through the ages. Finally, in a chemical climax, you might say, they came to life.

Well, that is what we would call spontaneous generation. However, our reading of the statements of the leading scientists of the day leads us to conclude that they generally hold the doctrine of biogenesis—that is, of life only from antecedent life: *omne vivum ex vivo*. Dr. Austin H. Clark, in his valuable book, *Zoogenesis: The New Evolution* (reviewed in a previous number of this magazine), reiterates again and again this principle of life coming only from life. Besides, there is no evidence that dead material was ever evolved into living matter by means of mere chemical combinations. And if it occurred once away back in the primeval ages, why does it not occur *now*? The same question may be asked regarding the whole evolutionary process: Why does it not take place *now*? And what has become of all the intermediate forms? If evolution is true, they should be here *now*, alive and kicking. Why did they all perish?

### What is the Best Explanation?

Of course, we do not pretend to explain the doctrine of creation from the standpoint of mere physical science. If we stop with mere material substance, we will never get very far in explaining things and their causes and purposes. However, when we look at the facts of nature as we find them, and then exercise our reason upon them, we may arrive at something like a satisfying conclusion. On these grounds we believe that the doctrine of orderly creation will best explain all the facts in the realm of nature. Since we see life coming only from preceding life, we can best explain the origin of organic life by an act of creation on the part of the *living* God. When we see vegetable and animal types from the amoeba up to man all breeding true to type, we may reasonably conclude that the Creator, in order to bring into existence an orderly and reliable natural realm, created each type in the beginning to reproduce "after its kind."

There you have an adequate explanation of the most outstanding fact in the natural realm—the persistency of type. Not only do you here assign an adequate cause for the grand effect, but you also find a rational purpose in the creation. Yes, theism—and Christian theism at that—is the only ade-



quate and rationally satisfying world-view.

### Ten Great Riddles

A well-written article in the New York *Times* tells us about "ten great riddles that call for solution by scientists" and over which they are cudgeling their brains as much today as they did when you and I were young more than fifty years ago. It would seem that they are no nearer a solution now than they were then. The statement of these riddles shows just how riddlesome they are. Some of the problems dealt with are: the solar system and how it came about; the puzzle of our earth; the mystery of the upper atmosphere; are other worlds inhabited? Is the sun dying? Is there a vast sun which is the center of the universe? the extent of the universe; sky wanderers (the source of the meteorites); the mystery of space; lastly, the origin of the material of the universe. Every one of these facts presents an insoluble problem to the physical scientist today. While we gladly give these savants credit for giving the world many useful inventions, it is, nevertheless, becoming in them to be humble in the face of the many primary problems that they cannot solve.

### More Discoveries—More Mysteries

It seems that the more the scientists discover about the cosmos, the more they are groping in Puzzle Land. A scientific writer says significantly: "The recent sensational discovery of Pluto, the ninth planet, has raised more problems than it has helped to solve." And why? It "has more than doubled the volume of the solar system, and has extended its domain one-third further into the deep gloom of space. The extent of the solar domain, instead of being settled, now appears to be an open question." Then, too, the discovery of Pluto seems to give the final blow to the once-popular nebular hypothesis of Laplace, and has likewise cast doubt on the so-called "tidal evolutionary hypothesis." Whatever theory is propounded, new discoveries seem to present difficulties that it will not explain. Well, one thing is sure—nature herself presents just as many insoluble mysteries as does theology.

### Some Men Too Easily Satisfied

However, some of the speculations of some of the scientists we are not inclined to accept. The writer above quoted informs us

—of course, we knew it before—that we human beings are chemically composed of the same elements as the earth and the stars. He says:

We are chemically made of nothing unusual or exotic. We are part of the general scheme of things, and we could ask for no higher immortality than to be, as we seem to be, made of the same undying stuff as the stars.

Here we must draw the line. As far as our bodies are concerned, they are, of course, like the material substance of the cosmos in chemical components; but there is something more in man. The stars are not sentient and self-conscious persons. They do not know that they exist. They do not think, reason, feel and will. They have no aspirations for continued existence. Hence man is different in his higher nature from the suns, moons and stars of the universe. Therefore he cannot be satisfied with the same kind of immortality as "the undying stuff of the stars." He desires a conscious immortality. Let us not be such groundlings as to be satisfied with being like mere material stuff.

### Dualism in Psychology

Well, the writer has been teaching—at any rate, *trying* to teach—Christian psychology at the Winona School of Theology, and at this writing has just finished his work. Naturally he is full of the subject. He has been insisting on Dualism as the only adequate explanation of "the mind-body problem." He is glad to say that his students responded favorably; and most of them were mature men and women, some of them expert and capable teachers in Christian schools. Others were pastors who have read and studied widely. It was most gratifying to note how readily they could see that no kind of monism could adequately explain the phenomena of human experience. It is true that all of them have had a rich and clear Christian experience, and that will explain a great deal; but they could also follow the rational process, and see how convincing it is for the doctrine of Dualism.

### What and Why

Dualism in Psychology means that man is composed of two entities, body and mind; or, to put it otherwise, of material and mental essence; and that these two entities are different in essence and functioning power, and yet cooperate and interact in the human personality in a wonderful way. How can



this doctrine be established? By experience. Somehow, explain it as you will, we are aware of both bodily and mental actions, and realize that they are different—yes, belong to different categories. The body functions in a purely material and mechanical way; the mind in a psychical way. The body carries on physiological processes; the mind mental processes. We cannot consistently say that the body is self-conscious, but the mind is. The latter also perceives, reasons, judges and wills; the body can do none of these things. How could people distinguish between bodily and mental processes if they had no minds to make such a distinction? Can neurones have self-consciousness? Can glands think and reason? No! We intuitively attribute all self-conscious states and acts to the mind. In order to think at all, man must have an entity to think with.

### How to Picture the Process

Of course, we are so constituted that we always try to visualize things and processes, even if they belong to the immaterial or psychical realm. So here. What is the most vivid way of visualizing the method of conscious perception? We think it is to image the mind as a self-conscious entity dwelling in the human brain as its organ or instrument. Now, when a stimulus, say, of sight or sound, is carried back into the cortex of the brain, there dwells the conscious mind ready to receive it and react. The mind might be likened to the operator at the central station of a telephone system. The moment a receiver is lifted the effect is carried along the wire to "Center," who at once, being on the alert, perceives the signal and inquires for the desired number. To our mind, there is no other way of explaining perception or any other mental phenomenon. Just as the physical apparatus is constituted by the Creator to carry messages and stimuli to the proper brain center, so the mind is constituted to cognize the meaning of those messages and stimuli.

### What About Dichotomy?

Some people believe that man is a dichotomy; others that he is a trichotomy. The former means that man is a twofold being, composed of mind (soul) and body; the latter that he is a threefold being, composed of body, soul and spirit. There are two passages of Scripture that seem to lend some support to the doctrine of trichotomy. They

are 1 Thess. 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12. However, we find some serious objections to trichotomy. One is that there are about a dozen different terms in the Bible for the mental part of man, like *ruach*, *leb* and *leb-bab*, in the Hebrew, and *pneuma*, *psuche*, *nous*, *ennoia* and *kardia*, in the Greek. So, if each term means a distinct entity, man would be quite a multiple being—which nobody believes. But more: if man is composed of body, soul and spirit, what becomes of the soul when bodily death occurs? Is it annihilated? That is not likely. So we believe it is best to think of the various psychical terms in the Bible as different aspects or functioning powers of the same entity—that is, the human mind. Then we can say that, when the body returns to dust, the mind (soul, spirit) goes to God who gave it (Ecclesiastes 17:7; Matt. 10:28).

### Yield Not to Evil

That is a challenging old gospel hymn:

Yield not to temptation,  
For yielding is sin;  
Each victory will help you  
Some other to win.

What many young people—and a lot of their elders, too—need today most of all, next to the grace of God, is *backbone*: the power of resistance; the courage and ability to say "No!" to the solicitations of evil. Let us teach the young man to be a *man*, not a *manikin*. Let us speak plainly to young people, and tell them that the excuse, "I couldn't help it!" when they succumb to temptation, is the excuse of the weakling. Some bracing injunctions from the Bible might put fiber and strength into the souls of the young: "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you;" "Quit you like men; be strong;" "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

### Determinism in Psychology

Much harm is being done to the youth of our land by the teaching of determinism in colleges and universities. This means that the will is not free, but is determined by bodily structure, heredity, environment, etc.; that no one is really responsible for his thoughts and actions. Such teaching is the cause of much irregularity and flabbiness among the young people of our day. If persisted in, it will destroy our civilization and undermine the free institutions of our Republic, which is founded on the principle



of liberty. It will produce a generation of weaklings and slaves. Far better is it to teach the young that they *can* overcome temptation if they will use their *wills*; far better to awaken, galvanize and stir their feeling of

responsibility. Let the young remember Emerson's bracing lines:

He who ruleth high and wise,  
Nor pauseth in His plan,  
Will tear the sun out of the skies  
Ere freedom out of man.

## Current Religious Thought

### Effective Evangelistic Preaching Themes

THE REVEREND MILTON THOMAS, A.B.

LET me begin by expressing quite frankly my own point of view, and the basis of this paper. I believe in doctrinal preaching. I believe in presenting the great Christian truths to the people. I recognize that these truths cannot be offered in a coldly intellectual way; but, when made throbbing with life and vital with experience, I hold that doctrinal preaching is essential both to evangelism and to the building up of the Christian Church as a living Christian organism.

With this fundamental conviction, and desiring to know just what truths would appear as having chief significance in the general mind of the Church, I address letters to a considerable group of active ministers, editors and teachers asking each one to prepare for me a list of the ten most important doctrines of Christianity. My original list contained forty names. Thirty-one of those addressed replied.

A word or two as to my work on the questionnaire. At first I thought it would be a simple task, but it proved to be a very complex one. A yes and no questionnaire is simple, but when writers are given the privilege of answering in any way they choose they become complex. Often I had to guess at what the answer meant. I grouped "Eternal Destiny" and "Judgment" together. This will illustrate how I had to combine statements under general doctrinal heads. But in spite of the fact that my study did involve considerable editorial labor the results presented are the opinions of my authorities, and not a list of Christian doctrines personally compiled. We have, then, below a list of the chief truths through which a minister

should lead the devout thought of the Church.

The most fundamental doctrine would seem to be the Personality and Fatherhood of God. God is the Creator-Father. He is the first cause, the creator and sustainer of the universe, the providence of men. He is not mere force but personality. He has intelligence. He takes a bearing. He chooses. He saw the plan of the universe before He created it. His attitude or bearing includes both love and hate. He loves men, but hates sin. God is the father of mankind by virtue of His having created them. In a special sense He is the father of those in Christ. It is through Christ that we reach the summit of our knowledge of God as Father.

The second doctrine would seem to be that of the Incarnation, Deity and Sonship of Jesus. Some may question my right to bring these truths concerning Christ under one heading; but I believe each minister had practically the same idea in his mind. To speak of Jesus as the Son of God means Incarnation; to speak of Incarnation means to affirm the deity of Christ. It was emphasized that though Jesus was the Son of God yet he was fully human. It was also emphasized that Jesus' Sonship was eternal; He was always the Son of God and always will be. One minister speaks of the "Son of God Incarnate" combining the two ideas of Jesus' Deity and humanity. In the incarnation He is divine and human. His character indicates that He is both God and Man. One says, "He is God in Human Life." Another puts it that he is "the eternal Son of God in human nature." The incarnation with a number is definitely connected with the vir-



gin birth although not many state the virgin birth as a separate doctrine. One minister speaking of the incarnation says, "To me all hangs on that." In some of the answers the incarnation and deity of Christ are mentioned together. A representative statement reads, "God the Son did become incarnate, the infinite in the finite, by the power of the Holy Ghost, through the womb of the Virgin Mary." A theological professor writes,\* "We believe in Him as the Son of God. It is not three Gods in whom we believe but in one God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord. His life, wholly given to God, was wholly filled by God in a true incarnation. And so we have in him not simply one other teacher about God but that presence of God which moves us to say, 'God was in Christ.'" I will quote one other statement concerning this doctrine. "I consider faith in the Deity of Jesus the foundation doctrine of Christianity. Accepting Him as God manifest in our flesh, we find his character revealing fully the character of God, we find a Divine authority in all His teaching by word and example."

The third doctrine is Jesus Christ, the Saviour. Perhaps this ought to be given as a sub-division under the Atonement, but it was separate in so many of my authorities that I must state it separately. "Jesus the Son of God" is "the Saviour provided by God for our redemption, experienced through faith." A bishop speaks of him as "A Divine Redeemer." Jesus is "the only Saviour of men." He saved them by dying for them. He is the "Saviour from Sin." Besides being our Saviour, He is our Teacher. One answer gives this as a necessary part of His saving man. Another answer gives as the basis of Christianity, "Faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world."

The fourth doctrine is the Atonement. The Atonement is Christ's offering of Himself upon the Cross, His dying for our sins. This was "Made possible by His Incarnation." One teacher of religion referred me to Methodism's twentieth Article of Religion. I will quote from this: "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone." Another writes, "Atonement, including the fact of the in-

carnation, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, the offering of Himself as the one perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, which atonement alone makes possible, but not necessary, the salvation of every man from sin." Still another teacher speaks of the "Atonement in the blood of Christ—A Fact for our faith—A fountain for our cleansing." "In the atonement, we see God taking upon Himself the awful penalty for sin's guilt—not laying it upon another." A professor sees in the atonement, "The principle of the Cross, related to vicarious suffering." Another teacher of religion speaks of, "Salvation by a blood sacrifice, taught and illustrated from the beginning of man's sin." This, he says, shows the principle of Atonement developed through the Old Testament. Another says, "This, I understand, is richer and fuller than any or all of our theories." I will let this statement sum up the doctrine of Atonement: "I believe that Jesus Christ died for all men to make possible their salvation from sin, and to make sure the salvation of all who believe in Him."

The fifth doctrine is the personality and work of the Holy Spirit. The doctrine of the Trinity was mentioned by some as one of the ten most important, but most implied it in statements concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit. Among my authorities one describes the "Holy Spirit as God working with men;" but the Holy Spirit is pointed out as a definite personality in a number of statements, while others imply it. He is said to have an "office work." As list of His works as given include His agency in revelation, in conversion, in character development, in world redemption, in the experience of conviction, as indwelling believers as Counselor, as Teacher, as Comforter, as Guide, and as One through whom we live victoriously. He is spoken of as having a part in "Adoption and Sanctification." The Holy Spirit "applies the redemptive work of Christ to lost men." I stopped as I read the statement of one preacher,—"The friendliness of the Holy Spirit." I thought, What better meaning can we find for the Paraclete?

The sixth doctrine is the Bible, the Revelation of God. With a number this is stated simply as: the Bible, the Bible as the Word of God, the Bible Supernatural Revelation, or the Bible the Inspired Word of God. Others make their answers more definite. A teacher definitely says he believes in "the

\* See editorial note at the end of this article.



plenary inspiration of the Bible." Another teacher shows a method of study disclosing the Bible as the "bearer of God's revelation to Man" and emphasizing both the divine and human in its makeup. One teacher refers me to Methodism's Article V. I quote from this: "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." I am going to give one lengthy statement in full:

Revelation, given in the Bible, as the Divinely inspired record of God's progressive historical revelation of Himself and His Will, in successive ages and dispensations, to the growing ability of man, under this Divine tutelage, to understand, appreciate and apply the Divine message to the practical affairs of character, life and destiny, till the revelation culminates in Jesus Christ and the mission and work of the Holy Spirit, thus making the Bible, in a unique and distinct sense, the Book of God, the Word of God, God's own message to man, the Only Standard of Faith and Conduct.

I will let an editor close the statement of this doctrine:

When it comes to the Bible, I think it is fair to say that in my church leaders are open-minded and reverent, but also place an implicit trust in the sufficiency of the Scriptures for salvation in the most comprehensive sense of the word.

The seventh doctrine is "the fact and nature of sin" which are the exact words of one authority. A large number stated this doctrine simply as "sin." Two said, "The reality of sin." Personally, I think there is a need today to stress the reality of sin to our people. Sin must be contrasted with righteousness. Here are three short statements concerning it. "I believe that all men are sinners." "Man as a sinner, all have sinned." "Man as sinful *i. e.* putting his own will above God's will."

Another statement reads, "The doctrine of man as a creative bearing the likeness and image of God, who of his own free will chose self as the center of his life instead of God, thus becoming separated from God through sin." I want to quote one more full statement on the nature of sin.

Sin, including the fact of natural depravity as the fountain of all evil in the world, and actual sin involving guilt; the former making regeneration necessary, the latter requiring forgiveness.

The eighth doctrine is Conversion. I have included under this head many statements, which are technically different but in actual

drive the same. They are: Conversion, the New Birth, Regeneration, Justification, Forgiveness, Salvation from Sin, and Redemption. While each of these refer to a special phase of the beginning of the Christian life, they all refer to the same work of grace. Generally speaking, these terms may be used interchangeably. The purpose is to make a person a child of God.

Here is a chain of reasoning given in one answer: Those who repent receive forgiveness of sins. Those who receive forgiveness of sins are made new creatures in Christ Jesus. Those who are made new creatures in Christ Jesus are accepted as Children of God. Another answer states that grace is received "Through Jesus Christ, including Forgiveness or Justification by Faith, Regeneration or the renewal by the Holy Spirit, and the New Birth into the Family of God, making the believing penitent a new creature in Christ." Another says concerning Conversion, "This I regard as among the most important doctrines, though it must be dealt with in the most careful way, with delicacy and great wisdom, because there may be as many kinds of conversions as there are people."

The ninth doctrine is that of Immortality. It is spoken of under various terms such as: Immortality, hope beyond the grave, life after death, future life, immortal life, and the resurrection. There are many terms we may use to describe "this blessed hope." It is based by one on "the reality of the spiritual" and is "faith, a venture into the beyond." Another says: "We believe also in immortality of the soul—not simply the immortality of influence, but actual personal immortality."

I will close with this comprehensive statement our precious Christian hope:

Man's immortality is in his total being, including soul and body. This last involves the whole Biblical eschatology; the intermediate self-conscious state of the soul, the resurrection and glorification of the body, the apocalyptic second coming of Christ to bring in the era of new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

The tenth doctrine is the Final Judgment. Perhaps I have taken liberty in combining such statements as Eternal Destiny and The Final Judgment. But these refer to the same fact. The judgment is "the laws of reward and retribution vitally interpreted." Judgment is the "necessary outcome of Providence and the Spirit." "These are several



and different in character." It is the realization of "personal responsibility." It is administered according to the deeds of this life." In this judgment "God is the Judge, Jesus Christ the measure," and the judgment is the "reward of works."

Here is the list of the Ten Most Important Doctrines of Christianity as developed by this study:

1. The Personality and Fatherhood of God.
2. The Incarnation, Deity and Sonship of Christ.
3. Jesus Christ as Saviour.
4. The Atonement.
5. The Personality and Work of the Holy Spirit.
6. The Bible, the Divine Revelation of God.
7. The Fact and Nature of Sin.
8. Conversion.
9. Immortality.
10. Final Judgment.

To these already given, I am going to add six others which received considerable mention but were omitted from the above list because the question called for but ten doctrines. These sixteen doctrines will make an excellent structure upon which to build a preaching programme. The six additional doctrines are:

1. Justification by Faith.
2. The Kingdom of God.
3. Holiness or Sanctification.
4. Christian Service.
5. The Love of God.
6. The Resurrection of Christ.

I here wish to express my grateful appreciation to those who replied to my questionnaire on the *Ten Most Important Doctrines of Christianity*. They were as follows:

*Teachers of Bible and Religion.* Irwin R. Beiler of Allegheny College; F. H. Clapp of Gammon Theological Seminary; F. C. Eischen of Garrett Biblical Institute; Charles C. Ellis of Juniata College; P. B. Fitzwater of Moody Bible Institute; Agnes Gerken of Saint Luke's Hospital School of Nursing; Isaac T. Headland of Mount Union College; Leander S. Keyser of Hamma Divinity

School; Albert Knudson of Boston University School of Theology; Edwin Lewis of Drew University School of Theology; Sam Maxwell of Asbury College; Henry H. Meyer of Boston University School of Religious Education; Frank P. Morris of Asbury Theological Seminary; Joseph Owen of John Fletcher College; Harris F. Rall of Garrett Biblical Institute; A. Lincoln Shute of Taylor University.

*Editors.* L. O. Hartman of *Zion's Herald*; William H. Leach of *Church Management*; John Paul of the *Christian Witness*; Harold Paul Sloan of *CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE*; Ralph B. Urmey of the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate*.

*Active Ministers.* Bishop Herbert Welch of Pittsburgh; Bishop E. C. Richardson of Philadelphia; John H. Clemens of Jamestown; C. G. Farr of New Castle; A. C. Locke of Erie; Wm. P. Murray of Meadville; F. M. Redinger of Clarion; H. H. Barr of Franklin; J. A. Galbraith of Ridgeway; Chas. E. Petree of Grove City; P. N. Taylor of South Dayton.

*Parkers Landing, Pennsylvania*

NOTE—The Reverend Mr. Thomas is not stating his own position in the doctrinal statements developed above so that in pointing out the inadequacy of one of his authorities in the doctrine of the person of Christ no criticism of him is involved. Since all of these quotations are anonymous there can be nothing personal involved.

It is true that Christianity does not understand the Deity as three gods; but it does understand Him as three centers of self-conscious personality in one Divine Being. The ground of each center of self-conscious personality in the Godhead being the totality of God there is no tri-theistic confusion in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The philosophy of the Incarnation is that the eternal personal Son of God took human nature upon Him as an act of measureless divine self-sacrifice in time. Jesus is God incarnate not because as human He yielded Himself to God, and was wholly filled by God; but because as Divine, in self-sacrifice, He took upon Himself our humanity. The putting of the Incarnation presented by this theological professor is Unitarian, and reduces Jesus to a superlatively spirit baptized human being. Any statement of the Incarnation which starts with a man Jesus is Unitarian. Christianity starts not with a man Jesus, but with the Eternal Son of God who took upon Himself human nature.—EDITOR.

SEE the suggestion of the editors and publisher on the second page—opposite the hymn? Read it—it will interest you!



# The Present Relation of Science to Religion

GALEN B. ROYER, D.D.

IN order to anticipate the discussion somewhat the assignment will be considered as follows:

- I. Definition of terms and some orientation.
- II. Should there be any conflict between Science and Religion?
- III. There is conflict.
- IV. Who is blameworthy for the conflict?
- V. Noble Endeavor to avoid conflict.

First, then, definition of terms and some orientation.

Considering the word Science in fullest meaning it includes (quoting from Standard Dictionary):

First. Science proper, embracing (a) exact knowledge of facts (*i. e.* historical or empirical science); (b) Exact knowledge of laws, obtained by correlating facts (*i. e.* nomological science); and (c) exact knowledge of proximate causes (Rational science); and

Second, Philosophy—namely, the general principles, laws, or causes, that furnish the traditional explanation of anything.

Science, therefore, is knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking, particularly as methodically formulated and arranged into a rational system.

Hypothesis, the beginning of most propositions and principles of Science, at its best is but "a statement of fact (Standard further) or of a theory which without itself having been proved, is taken for granted as a premise from which to test or discover an assured conclusion." Though any knowledge of some department of science may be correct as far as it goes, that knowledge, however, well formulated, has not become a complete science until all the facts in all the world have come under correct observation and knowledge. A perfect spring day is more than the song of birds and the blossoms on peach trees. It perhaps is not too dogmatical to say that Science in any department does not contain complete knowledge. Hence it is assumed that the assignment wishes to have Science in its incomplete form considered in its relation to religion.

That word religion needs definition also. In a lexicographer's mind (Standard) "it is a belief in an invisible super-human power

(or powers) conceived after the analogy of the human spirit, on which (or whom) man regards himself dependent, and to which (or whom) he thinks himself in some degree responsible." In the great world religions, especially in Christianity, religion has developed into faith in One perfect One, as the ground and Lawgiver of the Universe and the Father and Redeemer of mankind. That definition includes all religions—for instance, Clarks Ten Great Religions of the World: nine of which were of little value because none of the nine gave any stimulus to what may be termed Science.

It has remained for Christianity to give impetus to Science. To speak in the words of Dr. M. I. Pupin of Columbia University, quoting from Preface of F. D. Leete's *Christianity in Science*, Abingdon Press, 1928:

Science and the fine arts flourished in countries where Christianity flourished. There is a quickening spirit in Christianity which no other religion has ever exhibited. If we read the lives of the great men in science and in the fine arts, we will convince ourselves that their successful efforts were in a great measure due to the stimulating influence of the Christian religion.

Is it not passing strange, then, as one reflects, to note that under the benign influence of Christianity where Science has made its greatest advancement and the largest contribution to the world, is to be found its bitterest opponents?

Second. Should there be any conflict between Science and the Christian Religion?

Here some orientation is important. Consideration must be twofold, namely: The Bible as God's revealed will; and the Spirit of Christianity revealed in that Bible.

Grant that the Being who spoke the world into existence is the same One who by what is termed inspiration—that mysterious supernatural overruling that has made a library of 66 books written by over 30 different hands covering a period of about sixteen centuries, yet just one great Book, the Book of all books, standing the test of time, resisting the attacks of its enemies and ever widening its influence,—a Book pointing mankind back to God—and there should be no conflict between Science in its complete-



ness and the utterances of the Bible where they relate to or have to do with each other. It is inconceivable for the Infinite to have conflict within Himself, or between the productions of His Almighty Hand. And it is probable that reference to this harmony hereinafter mentioned largely rests on this understanding concerning the Almighty.

But when the Spirit of Christianity is to be considered in its relation to Science, there is the possibility of a different situation. It is conceivable that the same Infinite One who made the laws for the material universe might or even did make different laws for the Spirit world. Some things point to that possible difference.

In the scientific world two times two is four and not three or five. In that particular there is absolute unvariableness as far at least as finite mind can comprehend. But in speaking of things of the Spirit Nicodemus who lived by rule and form, was plainly told:

That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit (Holy Spirit) is spirit . . . The wind bloweth where it will, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.

"So is" points to the fact that no law governs the work of the Spirit in the hearts of men. While there are natural laws that appear to and possibly do operate similarly in the Spirit world these words from Christ himself point strongly to what is the experience of devout Christians, namely, that there are no known laws that govern the work of the Holy Spirit at all times.

But again, Science and the Spirit of Christianity are different in the process of experience. Science promulgates an hypothesis and proceeds to prove its correctness by all the experiences it can command. The more extended the experience, the more nearly correct the hypothesis becomes; but experience may prove the hypothesis wrong. In the Spirit of Christianity the reverse is true. Not hypothesis but certainty, facts, utterance of the Infinite is the very beginning, the unvarying testimony of the process and the end of experience. "If ye abide in my word . . . ye shall know the truth (the truth of the beginning) and the truth shall make you free."

Continued experience in Christ confirms a truth that was truth before the experience began. In Science experience does or does not sustain the hypothesis. In Christianity the fact is sustained with increasing certainty

(if such comparison is admissible) from beginning to end. This difference is kept in mind by many noteworthy scientists.

And why should it not be so? Christianity does not turn its back on the truth at any time for it knows, yes knows, that nothing can be truth which turns its back on God.

Prof. Pupin says: "Service is the watchword of both Science and Christianity." Is it not possible that the whole purpose of life from one viewpoint is couched in that nutshell?

Vernon L. Kellogg, zoologist, says, "The cause of things is called God; the manner of things, Science."

William E. Ritter says: "Seeing God in the universe is no more difficult than seeing electrons there. We have ample testimony concerning both; concerning neither have we complete and final knowledge."

Charles W. Hargitt, zoologist, in *Problems of Science and Faith* (Methodist Review, 1924) expresses this conviction:

When we come to recognize the fact that the natural and spiritual are not separated and unrelated realms ruled by distinctly different laws, but rather expressions of one and the same universe, and governed by the same infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed, we shall find ourselves exclaiming with one of the ancients, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge." These are the realms of the Infinite God and in them there is neither end nor shadow of turning.

Verily, Science has unfolded and revealed many supernatural phenomena, but that does not make them less supernatural. The result is not the destruction of the supernatural but the enlargement of the boundaries of the unknown in the natural. When Scientists assume the attitude of T. M. Lowry who said, "We must know and see God whole. Religion is supernatural, not anti-natural. It may be beyond one's knowledge, but it is not contrary to the rules," they will not go far wrong in any scientific research.

*Third.* There is conflict between Science and Religion.

Turn first to Christianity's most uncompromising enemies, the atheists and agnostics and their adherents, both in the fields of Philosophical and of Physical Sciences.

This dogmatic assertion made by one Joseph McCabe of England commands early attention. The statement appeared in the *Literary Guide and Rationalistic Review*, the official organ for the Rationalistic Press



and is quoted from Introduction of Arthur H. Tabrum's book, *Religious Beliefs of Scientists*. Here is the assertion: "Beyond all question the higher culture of America is Rationalistic from New York to California." If the writer may be depended upon then Science in this country was twenty years ago and still is opposed to religion almost unanimously. Those words, "Beyond all question" includes by implication complete and final investigation.

But what is the standing of this Rationalistic Association among the Free-Thinkers of its own land? In the same *Literary Guide* that out-spoken Rationalist, Dr. F. Y. Conybeare of Oxford, confessed that "At present the Association can hardly be mentioned in any society of educated men without provoking a sneer."

Nevertheless, to the more thoughtful and informed the situation in the Scientific world presents a serious opposition to Christianity.

It is no pleasure to present the following but it belongs to the survey. Karl Marx has large following even today. He says:

We make war against all prevailing ideas of religion . . . The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilization. It must be destroyed. The true root of liberty, of equality, of culture, is atheism.

Another of his kind says:

The beginning of lies that have ground down this poor world to slavery . . . is God. . . . The first lie is God. The second lie is the idea of right.

The well-known G. Bernard Shaw, a leader in certain circles of thought, in speaking to undergraduates at Cambridge on the subject, *The Future of Religion*, is reported to have said:

The mention of God has gone out of fashion. . . . When Chas. Darwin came along with his theory of natural selection, people jumped at it and kicked God out the window.

Then there is Nietzsche, who at least before the Great War had ardent and strong following on both sides of the Atlantic. He says:

Such ideas as mercy and pity and charity are pernicious, since they mean a transference of power from the strong to the weak, whose proper business is to serve the strong. Remember that self-sacrifice and brotherliness and love are not real moral instincts at all; but mere manufactured compunctions to keep you from being your *true* self.

These famous men belong to foreign shores. Now with profit come nearer home.

There perhaps is no more painstaking and thorough American authority on the subject under consideration than Dr. James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology and Pedagogy in Bryn Mawr College. He is author of *A Psychological Study of Religion: Its Origin, Function and Future*. His last book is *A Psychological Study of Mysticism*. In his book, *The Belief in God and Immortality* (1916) he seeks to be fair to both sides of the two main questions he raises and discusses in the light of statistics gathered. His statistical section is especially guarded and reduces the possibility of error to a minimum. Concerning answers to his questionnaire submitted to classes in "non-technical departments" of nine colleges of high rank, and two classes (78 answers) of a Normal school, a total of nearly 1,000 answers received, he says that "97% are from students between 18 and 20 years of age." On the question, "Do you think of God as a personal or impersonal Being?" 31% of the men and 11% of the women conceived God impersonal. He further states, "If the doubtful are added then 40.5% of the men and 15.7% of the women is the proportion. . . . Considering all together my data," says Leuba, "they would indicate that from 40% to 50% of the young men leaving college, entertain an idea of God incompatible with the acceptance of the Christian religion, even as interpreted by the liberal clergy." On the belief of immortality, he says:

The most striking result of this inquiry is the high percentage of believers in the lower classes and the relatively high percentage of disbelievers in the higher classes. Only 15% of freshmen reject immortality and 4% uncertain; while nearly 32% of the juniors have given up and 8% uncertain. The statistics reveal the interesting fact that a considerable number of believers do not think the loss would have any influence upon their lives. Immortality is for them a fact without significance. It is noteworthy that almost 25% of those who cannot declare a belief in immortality nevertheless desire it; and that of these four-fifths belong to the two upper classes in college.

Turning to the section devoted to Scientists we note that Professor Leuba had the editor of *American Men of Science*, without knowing to what purpose the names would be used, select at random under a method that avoided duplication of two groups each of 500 scientists from a list of nearly 5,500 found in a volume entitled *American Men of Science*. Each group was made up of 300 lesser and 200 greater lights in the scientific world. Every precaution was taken



against error,—fairness is a very marked attitude in the statistical section of his book. Taking the entire 1,000 as a whole, 50.6% believe “in a God in intellectual and affective communication with man, meaning a God to whom one can pray in the expectation of receiving an answer (answer not to mean subjective, psychological effect of prayer)” while doubters and unbelievers make up 49.4%.

Narrowing the study to the Physical Scientists and placing the doubters with the unbelievers, 43.9% believe in God as defined above and 50.7% believe in immortality. Among the biological scientists 30.5% believe in God as defined above and 37% believe in immortality. On the point of desire for immortality among those who do not believe in it, 83.8% of the lesser, and 67.7% of the greater biologists have intense desire for immortality even when they do not believe in it. On the other hand, 70.7% of the lesser and 60.4% of the greater have no desire for immortality.

The foregoing data raise the question. Should Science replace religion in the life of the world? Thus contend a number of prominent scientists. Let William Hamilton Woods speak for those who thus believe today. In his book (mark the title) *The Religion of Science*, he points out that the religion that is to replace Christianity has truth, beauty and goodness as objects of worship. He does not need an organized church in order to be religious. He is a Truth-seeker and the best place to worship is out of doors. Rationality is the watchword—he needs no traditional faith. The supernatural simply must not be tolerated. Nature is everything there is. Man, body, mind, society are results purely of natural forces. The Bible is simply human literature.

Do not these sentiments more or less appeal to many groups of men in Christian lands who do not hesitate to say what kind of a religion, or even of Christianity, can be permitted today? And how far removed are such sentiments of materialism from the Godless and godlessly rank propaganda now forced upon the people of Russia and stealthfully and assiduously planted even in our own land? In a recent *Literary Digest* appears the following from Moscow's organ for the Society of the Godless:

Pigs and fertilizer are useful, but preachers of faith in God are hurtful to our business. No gang of bandits are as harmful as the organization of

preachers and religionists. No book, no matter how impure, has done as much damage as the Bible.

*The N. Y. Christian Advocate* (Methodist) comments upon the above by declaring:

It is only a step from the prevalent passive paganism of our own country to the militant paganism of which Russia is now its most conspicuous victim.

Russia's godless work may not be scientific as defined herein, but it joins forces with those whose only religion is Science, and intensifies the struggle against the Christian religion.

Properly all those scientists and philosophers who may be classified as materialists—including mechanists, behaviorists, pessimists, humanists—all of whom are materialists in implications and atheists in preachments, must be classed against Christianity in a more or less militant form.

That the Christian religion, then, for some mysterious reason, invites and fosters research in the scientific realm and then should produce such monstrosities among thinking men of the “higher culture” as Leuba points out, is unexplainable, unless their eyes are blinded by error and they walk in darkness and know it not.

Yet, thank God for the challenge that such antagonism gives Christianity. It commands the best at the hands of Christians to offset such teaching and doctrine.

*Fourth.* Who is to blame for the conflict?

Leete's *Christianity and Science* in his chapter on *The Present Situation*, from which quotation for this paper is taken both freely and verbatim, says:

It must be admitted that influences are at work in literature, in the school room, and in the church which call for the serious attention both of Christian thinkers and of all well-wishers of mankind. During seasons of general criticism and restlessness inhibitions are relaxed, and men who at heart have always been materialists, atheists, and pessimists begin more assiduously and openly to put the virus into the veins of youth and into the public mind. Occasionally such teachers are found in school faculties, even of denominational institutions. Any attempt to weed one of them out is widely advertised as constituting “persecuting Science.” Sensational publicists who are not at all scientists, though occasionally quoted as such, put forth teachings which are as scientifically unreliable as they are, sometimes, ethically dangerous. Science should not be held accountable for McCabe's rationalism or for Sprading's libertarian dogmatism.

The problem of responsibility for the conflict is admittedly complex. The impression is extant that in the main Science is atheistic and hostile to Christianity. Prof.

Robert A. Millikan, California Institute of Technology and late president of American Association of Science, is worthy to be heard:

I am not going to place the whole blame for the existence of his controversy upon misguided leaders of religion. The responsibility is a divided one, for science is just as often misrepresented as religion by men of little vision, of no appreciation of its limitations, and of imperfect comprehension of the real role it plays in human life—by men who lose sight of all spiritual values and therefore exert an influence upon youth which is unsettling, irreligious and sometimes immoral.

And it may be that Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, in his recent book (1930), referring to the conflict between Science and Religion, is getting close to the root of the antagonism and its attending deep concern. (Quotation is from book review appearing in *Journal of Religious Education*.)

Religious thought in our time is characterized by the utmost timidity and diffidence. The liberal religious forces, having disported themselves for a decade in an attack upon orthodoxy, now find themselves confronted with the real foe of all religion—liberal and orthodox alike—materialism and atheism. The result is panic, confusion, and humanism. The real struggle is between two opinions—the materialistic and the spiritual conception of the universe—neither of which is scientifically demonstrable. Religion takes the latter view and champions the reality of God; the reality of personality; the reality of truth, beauty and goodness.

#### *Fifth. Noble endeavors to avoid Conflict.*

Verily, in the world's history thus far, this is the golden age of the practical products of Science. Turn into whatever field of research one may. Science has given wonders upon wonders. She has transformed physical life into countless benefits and advantages. She has given man astronomy for astrology, chemistry for alchemy, freedom for serfdom, commerce for piracy, missions for monasticism, medicine for magic. Instead of sweeping plague, prolonged life and better health; instead of farming according to the signs, scientific farming producing more and better crops. Though hard on labor conditions today, applied science is turning out double and treble the product, better in quality, with half or less men. Science has plunged into the bowels of the earth, the depths of the sea and mounts on wings into the higher stratas of the air. Her voice girdles the earth in a few moments of time. Who dare venture to make a complete survey of what science has done for civilization—and he is to be considered hardly of a sound mind who does not see and who is

not thankful for man's greatest physical benefits growing out of patient, persisting, and painstaking research of Science.

Further. One is not only compelled but glad to admire the humble attitude of many great scientists and words from a few may be stimulating today. In *Hibbert Journal*, July 1909, appears this word of precaution:

Science grows more cautious and restrained, and feels her limits more intimately. She knows that the pretense of solving the "world riddle" by her means alone is a mere echo of youthful enthusiasm.

Likewise Edwin Slosson, noted Chemist, should be heard. In one of his *Sermons of a Chemist* these weighty words appear:

The belief that God wound up the world in the beginning and set it running and that it has been running by itself ever since, except for a little regulation now and then is rank materialism. We believe in God the Sustainer as well as God the Creator. We believe in God of the present; not merely a God who did something once, but a God who does everything now.

Then there is Henry Higgins Lane, biologist, member of Disciples of Christ. In *Evolution and Christian Faith*, he stands for a God of imminence and transcendence, of law and order, of gravitation and evolution. Using his own words:

If Christianity of the New Testament is good and true, as we believe it is, the discoveries of science should not contradict it, but complete its verification. He thinks Christ is part of the Godhead, not subject to science. Incarnation is to be accepted by the believer as a unique event. Miracles occur by unknown laws. Gravitation is superseded by other laws, and it is not miraculous to us that this transpires. Christianity is God's plan in the Spiritual world, as the laws of nature are his plan in the physical world.

Shailer Matthews, University of Chicago, in his book, *Contributions of Science to Religion*, 1924 (D. Appleton & Co.) devotes Part I to the world given to man by Science, every chapter by a different author of national and international reputation. Part II discusses Scientific Co-operation with Nature—writers of similar calibre. Part III has four chapters by Dr. Matthews himself, namely: Evolution and Religion, Scientific Method and Religion, Science Justifies the Religious Life; and Science gives Content to Religion. At the close he puts into cold print these significant words:

We reach thus the end of our study, not in an absolute knowledge of that which lies beyond experience, nor yet in some truth that is beyond doubt, but in the right to live religiously. Religion is more than human knowledge. It is life itself,



adjusting itself to the mystery of its environments, gaining from that experience new and more personal environment of society. It can therefore never be identical with science, nor is it to be subsumed under science. Action is more than an accumulation of facts. Nor does religion wait upon science. It antedates Science. Need of the body and of personality are imperative and cannot wait for a knowledge as to how they shall be fully satisfied.

A little further on:

*No science is competent to explain all the facts.* Precision of generalization must not be reached by omitting recalcitrant facts. A humanity that is only a group of mechanistic and chemical reactions is not the humanity we know. Love, Faith, Aspiration, Discontent, Courage and Religion are activities which must be included in our understanding of human life.

A Conclusion not meant to be dogmatical or pragmatical.

If Science be narrowed down to the so-called scientists of lesser and larger calibre than the relation between Science and Religion is by a large margin antagonistic to Christianity. But if Science may include with that smaller number of Christian Scientists the ever increasing multitude whose hard common sense has not been blinded by "much learning" and an unbelieving heart and desire, then the relationship as relates to Christianity is most hopeful. Time does not admit of a survey of how God has shut the mouths of the lions of unbelievers and infidels in every modern century. The outlook is bright and promising from this vantage.

But bear a moment longer for this consideration. Almost four centuries ago Copernicus promulgated his theory of the solar system. That and Newton's law of gravitation have rested as satisfactory scientific facts in all our minds. But hyst! Einstein! Einstein! Does any one care to forecast where these century old scientific facts will land in the hands of Einstein and his kind? Then, pray, what theory of science dare be trusted, tied to, built upon?

Within proper definition and orientation any theory of science is good and admissible for investigation. But the novice, the less than half baked scientist and their followers do not in many instances even understand definition and orientation; but they plunge headlong into the world of thought producing confusion and their sad result is unbelief.

In these days very, very few men are able to be authority in more than one field and most are not very good authority even in the one. Is your reader too dogmatical to

say that at best a good preacher is in most instances at least a poor scientist? Then, noting the ravages of unbelief following unhallowed science as set forth in this paper, and realizing that preachers are called to be exponents of faith in God and His Word, would it not be well to leave Science with all its uncertain theories out of the category of pulpit utterance and as much as possible out of private conversation? The better course is to build a better house of genuine faith in Jesus Christ, be better examples of real spiritual Christianity, and by the love which should mark Christians toward all enemies of religion, win them to the better mansion—the eternal with God. This is in fact every preacher's privilege and duty.

This suggestion is greatly emphasized by the significant words of none other than Henry Drummond, the author of *Natural Law in the Spirit World*. When facing the end of his illustrious journey he speaks to his old friend and fellow scientist, William Dawson, the great geologist of England. (Quot. from *Foreword in Where Go the Dead?* Rev. C. W. Hale Amos, M.A., D.D.) Says Drummond:

I am going away back to the Bible, to believe it and receive it as I did at first. I can no longer live on uncertainties. I am going back to the faith of the Word of God.

When one like Drummond calls the relatively large scientific world in which he succeeded so well "uncertainties," and he must go "away back" to get to the Bible, and *he does go back*, what business have we to spend one moment on these uncertainties when we have the *certain* and unsearchable riches of Christ to give to a needy world. Paul one time displayed a wonderful knowledge of science and philosophy on Mars Hill and then determined after his experience there "not to know anything save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." God grant that today everywhere preachers "follow Paul as he followed Christ."

*Johnstown, Pennsylvania.*

It seems important to add that many of the foremost scientists across the centuries and the very chief leaders in the field of physics and astronomy today are definitely religious and repeatedly also definitely Christian. There is a constant swing in intellectual currents. Sometimes it is toward the personal and religious. Sometimes it is toward the impersonal and naturalistic. Leuba's figures only register *one* of the downward oscillations of thought. Pupin, Compton, and Eddington stand as leaders in the new lift of thought to the appreciation of personality and God.—EDITOR.

## Personal Recollections of the Late Professor James Orr, D.D.

W. D. REID, M.A., D.D.

HOW swiftly time flies! James Orr, the giant of English-speaking Christianity during the opening decade of the twentieth century, is now a memory, a tradition. Men speak today of having seen Orr, and sat under Orr as the older generation used to speak to our burning hearts of having seen David Livingstone or Abraham Lincoln. It was my privilege during my college days to have sat under Orr, and therefore this paper.

It was during the winter of 1897, while a student in Edinburgh, Scotland, that I had my first contact with this distinguished scholar and servant of Jesus Christ.

I took a series of lectures under him in Church History. The class met on Saturday mornings in the Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, and Professor Orr's lectures that winter were on *The Rise and Development of the Roman Catholic Church*. That is thirty-five years ago, and now the great man is fast fading into the mists of the years. Six years later, in 1903, I had the privilege of hearing a second series of lectures by the same master mind. These lectures were on "The basal doctrines of the Christian faith," and were given at the Winona Lake Conference, at Winona Lake, Indiana, U. S. A.

Physically James Orr was a powerful man, weighing over two hundred pounds. He had a typically round Scottish lowland face, with a firm mouth and decided chin. He had a large pair of soft, almost pathetic brown eyes, which could flash fire very quickly at the sight of wrong or injustice. Usually, however, he was very gentle and self-controlled. In the class room he was usually very thoughtful and considerate; but if imposed upon in any way by the students, he usually settled the matter with one or two very biting sentences which the recalcitrant student never could forget. He is credited with having told his students in the autumn, when beginning classes, "If you lack learning we will try and give you that in these halls. If you lack Grace in your heart, God can give you that; but if you lack common sense, you had better go home, as neither God nor man can help you."

Mentally, James Orr was what I would call an intellectual giant. When attacking

any subject, one felt that he was gripping, down, down, down, until he had laid hold upon the very rock bottom. When his foundations were "Well and truly laid" then he would proceed with great deliberation to build thereon a strong, positive, logical superstructure. Step by step he would rise to the copestone; and when James Orr had at last finished with a subject, one felt that there was nothing more to be said upon it. Not only had he mighty brain power; but he had also a vast accumulation of information. He was cyclopedic. German was as familiar to him as English. The earlier languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Aramaic all seemed to be entirely familiar to him. His mind was not of the brilliant, versatile, flashy type; but rather, solid, substantial, strong, logical, exhaustive and above all conservative. Yet, his was not the conservatism of mere tradition. It was instead the conservatism of a well balanced judgment, that had carefully and candidly surveyed all the facts and had deliberately come to certain conclusions. Modernists respected him and were cautious about challenging his conclusions. Well indeed do I remember when one Modernist did venture to assail one of his statements in the Edinburgh newspapers. Orr replied immediately. The controversy went on for days and finally ended, of course, with his complete vindication. Professor Orr believed in the Bible from cover to cover as the inspired Word of God. He also believed and defended upon all occasions, the Deity and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Never will I forget his lecture at the Winona Conference on *Sin and the Atonement*. Before commencing, he said, with rather a knowing smile, "This morning (there was a real Scotch grip of the 'R') I am going to give you some pretty stiff food to chew and digest." He did. It was a powerful and masterly presentation, of that great, important though mysterious subject. His lecture on the *Rise and Development of the Roman Catholic Church* was the most remarkable analysis of that Church, and of how it came to attain its present form and position, to which I have ever listened. Often I have wished I could secure it in print. His books, *The Christian View of God and the World*,



*The History of Dogma, The Bible Under Trial*, with others, have been translated into the German language. When at the height of his power no British Theologian of his day was looked upon in Germany with such respect by both Liberals and Conservatives alike.

In private life he was rather silent and hard to draw out in conversation. He did not pride himself on his social qualities or his gifts as a conversationalist. He was not a society man at all. He was rather inclined to be an intellectual recluse. He seemed to be continually pondering great thoughts—the great thoughts to which he had given his life. He told me himself that he never felt happier than when in the quiet of his own study he was wrestling with mighty questions involving God and man, and their mutual relationships.

This stalwart defender of the faith went from us, now, many years ago; but his works, and his influence abide. Friends say his death was a triumph. He triumphed in the faith he had defended all his life. How fit an earthly end! Two of his contemporaries in Scotland were A. B. Bruce and

Marcus Dods. It was my privilege to sit under these also. Both of them became very markedly Modernistic in their latter days. When Bruce was dying (so I was told by the Rev. John MacNeill) he sent for his Evangelical friend Howie of Govan. When Howie came into the room, Bruce said to him, "Howie, have you any message for an old sinner who has lost the way?" Howie replied, "The blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth us from all sin." "Ah," said Bruce, "that is what I have been wanting, and I will cling to it to the last," and he did. When Marcus Dods was coming near the end he said to an intimate friend, "For years I have not been able to pray. God seems so far away that I cannot get near him. I have no source of comfort on which I can lean" (the *Canadian Presbyterian Record* is my authority for this); but when James Orr came to the experience of death he met it joyfully, triumphantly. So with sure confidence this servant of God passed into the presence of his Saviour and King, walking in that same light which all the years he had been proclaiming.

Montreal, Canada

## Parthenogenesis

JOHN G. FARROW, M.A.

LET us begin this paper by first understanding how normally an individual is produced and then note the phenomena of parthenogenesis.

The vertebrate animal body is a complex of numerous cells. The great majority of these cells are engaged in carrying on the various activities of daily life. Muscle cells contract, and produce motion and locomotion. Nerve cells convey impulses from one region to another, and thus bring distant parts into communication. Red blood corpuscles or cells carry oxygen from the lungs to all parts of the body; epithelial, or cells of the skin, synthesize and secrete substances which are used in some manner, or excrete waste products. These cells work in harmony in response to the demand put upon them. They are spoken of as somatic cells (somatic equals body). They compose the bulk of the body, and are concerned in its specific activities which collectively constitute the general economy of the body. When death occurs, all these cells die, and disintegrate without leaving any descendants.

There is in the body another group of cells

which differ in certain respects from the somatic cells. These cells are confined to the sex glands, to the testis in the male, and ovary in the female. They play very little part in individual economy. Their chief concern is in the perpetuation of the race. During the life of an individual of a given generation, they are discharged at certain times from the glands which contain them, and under proper conditions, they develop into new individuals of the succeeding generation. For this reason they are known as germ cells. Under ideal conditions of reproduction, therefore, they do not die and disintegrate, as do somatic cells, but are carried along into and with successive generations, always constituting the plasma from which the new individuals arise. Each sex has its own peculiar type of cell. The female carries the ovum (female sex cell or germ cell). The male carries the spermatozoon (sperm, male sex-cell or germ cell.)

The ovum is among the largest cell in the animal body. It is the egg. Three important parts of the egg are: first, the white opaque or the cytoplasm; second, the internal or the

yolk, which contains a third part, the nucleus. The nucleus is situated near the center of the ovum amidst the yoke granules. Its volume is small in comparison to the other parts of the ovum.

Compared with the ovum, the spermatozoon is an exceedingly small cell bearing little resemblance to the typical or ordinary cell. In most animals the spermatozoon is so small that the ovum of the same species exceeds it in bulk several hundred thousand times. The spermatozoon also differs from the ovum in that it is extremely motile.

During the development of germ cells, both male and female, it has been found that these cells tend to divide so that the nucleus is split in half, and two cells instead of one, are formed. This is a simple account of what is known as reduction division in germ cells.

It is interesting to note that in each nucleus, both of sperm and of ovum, in each specie of animal, there is a certain number of little rod-shaped structures which are the carriers of heredity. These structures are known as chromosomes. Each specie of animal has a definite number of these carriers of heredity, or chromosomes, so to speak, in the nucleus of its egg cell, the ovum, or the sperm cell, the spermatozoon. The frog has twenty-six of these little rod-like structures; the horse has sixty; man has forty-eight.

The union of the egg cell with the sperm cell results in the fertilization of that egg, and in the addition of the male chromosomes, which are one-half the original number found in the sperm cell; this is due to the process of splitting in half of the nucleus in reduction division. The fertilized egg then develops, under ideal conditions, into a mature individual having the full number of chromosomes of its species, half of which have come from the egg, and half from the sperm. This then is normal sexual reproduction.

And now, with these facts in mind, let us consider parthenogenesis. Parthenogenesis is a phenomenon in which eggs of various organisms, capable of sexual reproduction, develop into adults without the initiating influence of the sperm. That is to say, they develop into an adult organism without being fertilized by a male germ cell. Parthenogenesis then has a deep significance in the study of the mechanism of fertilization. In 1847 Bousier first started this work. He

noticed that a number of unfertilized silk worm eggs could be made to hatch by controlling variations of the amount of sunlight to which the eggs were exposed.

The first real work in the methods of producing parthenogenesis artificially were conducted by Tichomiroff in 1886. He performed two experiments which form the basis for all the work being done along this line at the present time. He found that by treating unfertilized eggs of a silk worm with sulphuric acid, he was able to activate them so that they developed into embryos. He obtained similar results when he brushed a batch of these eggs vigorously and allowed them to develop under normal conditions.

Hertwig continued these observations at this time but had little success since the animals upon which he experimented were capable also of a natural means of parthenogenesis. These experiments with animals which were naturally parthenogenic, lead to some very interesting discoveries in this field.

Natural parthenogenesis was not a new discovery, for this phenomenon was known long before the importance of the sperm in fertilization was recognized. It was early in the eighteenth century that Beaumont, and Bonnet, and others, found that many plant lice and other species of animals, could bring forth their young without pairing. And Kirby found that these could produce generation after generation of females and that it took special conditions for adults of both sexes to be produced. It is known at the present time that a great number of lower species, especially insects and crustacea, capable of producing sexually, can also produce normal offspring parthenogenetically.

Before going into a discussion of parthenogenesis as it is accomplished in the laboratory, it might be more interesting and clearer if we looked into the manner in which it occurs in nature. Because of the development of parthenogenesis to such a high degree in the honey bee, I will use this animal as an example.

In 1845 Dzierzon started experiments leading to the conclusion that male bees or drones arise from unfertilized eggs, and that the workers and queens arise from fertilized eggs. The queen, who does all the egg laying for the swarm, copulates only once in her life. This process of reproduction takes place in the air during her nuptial flight, and from then on the sperm are kept alive



in her receptaculum, the duct of which is passed by the egg as it is extruded. As the queen lays an egg in a worker cell, a sperm is extruded as the egg passes the opening of the duct, and thus the egg becomes fertilized; but when she lays an egg in a drone cell, no sperm is extruded. This action was formerly attributed to instinct or even consciousness on the part of the bee, but it is now easily explained as the result of a physical action. Observation shows that the worker cell is narrower so that as the queen squeezes into that cell to lay an egg, the muscles which empty the receptaculum are reflexly or mechanically set into action. In the drone cells, which are larger, there is no squeezing and no sperm are extruded.

There are several facts to substantiate these observations. First, for example, queens which have been prevented from taking their nuptial flight and are thus prevented from having copulation, invariably give rise only to drones. Old queens who continue to lay eggs after the sperm chamber has been emptied, also produce drones. This is the case also with the workers, which due to the rudimentary development of sex organs, cannot copulate, but nevertheless have been known to lay eggs. Although few species of insects, crustacea, and echinoderms (sea-urchins) show this phenomenon in such a specialized form, we do find them using parthenogenic methods as a natural mode of reproduction.

It is interesting to note that in the majority of cases, eggs which develop parthenogenetically tend to mature into males, whereas eggs which develop by normal fertilization may develop either into males or females. The explanation for the development of males in parthenogenetic reproduction is this: the egg which develops has just half the number of chromosomes (haploid), as does the egg which develops normally, being fertilized by the union of sperm with the egg. The union of the sperm with the egg gives the full number of chromosomes, which is a diploid number. The egg contributes half the number of chromosomes, and the sperm the other half.

Morgan explains the fact that the haploid eggs are always male by the theory that since there are usually one or two chromosomes less in the male than in the female, the haploid egg must necessarily be a potential male, and only when it receives a sperm containing the larger number of chromosomes can

it become a female. Also, if it receives a sperm with a lesser number of chromosomes, it will become a male, but when it receives no sperm, and must develop parthenogenetically, it must necessarily become a male. This theory is substantiated by the fact that in all animals already studied, and having both parthenogenesis and sexual fertilization as a means of reproduction, the haploid eggs develop into males, and the diploid eggs develop into males and females in about equal proportion. This should fulfill the necessary discussion of the phenomenon of parthenogenesis as it occurs naturally; and now let us proceed with a study of the means by which it is produced artificially.

As a great many important things occur by accident, so Dewitze had the good fortune, while working in Berlin, to accidentally throw a bunch of unfertilized frogs' eggs into a solution of corrosive sublimate, and caused them to start a type of primary development which is called cleavage. He was surprised the next morning to find that they were swollen and segmented. It is probably fair to say, since he conducted no microscopic examination of the nucleus, that instead of cleavage, as he thought, all he observed was a coagulation phenomenon which was characterized by the wrinkling of the surface of the egg.

With these new observations as early work in parthenogenesis, an interest had been created which, with the study of cytology and the finer processes of nuclear division, in the later part of the nineteenth century, led to the accomplishment of more important research. One of the first of this group of workers was T. H. Morgan, who was able, by several different methods, to cause unfertilized eggs to begin segmentation. Aside from the interest created his experiments were of little avail, for the eggs disintegrated after a time without giving rise to larvae. In 1899 Jacques Loeb succeeded in causing the unfertilized eggs of sea urchins to develop into swimming larvae, by treating them with hypertonic sea water (water highly concentrated with salt), after which he returned them to their natural medium during the period of growth. It was not long before similar results were obtained with the eggs of a great many marine animals such as molluscs, starfish, and annelids, none of which can develop under normal conditions unless it has been fertilized by the entrance of a spermatozoon. These ex-

periments added very little except to show that the action of the sperm could be reproduced by a purely physio-chemical agency, hypertonic sea water, and its action was unknown except that it was capable of drawing water by osmosis from the egg. There was at this time no evidence to indicate that the action of a sperm consists in causing the egg to lose water.

At this same time it was known that upon the entrance of the sperm into an egg, a membrane was formed about the surface of the egg, and separated from it by liquid. In experiments performed by Hertwig and Herbst, it was shown that a membrane could be formed by dipping the eggs in Xylol or Chloroform, but that the eggs perished immediately. This fertilization membrane, as it is called, was thought to have no other function except in preventing sperm, other than the one which had fertilized the egg, from entering it. However, in 1915 Loeb found that due to the membrane formation, essential features in the development of the egg are initiated for the process of its development. He observed that when the unfertilized eggs of sea urchins were put into water with a few c.c. of acids (such as acetic or buteric) for a few minutes, and then returned to normal sea water, the majority of them formed fertilization membranes, but after a few cleavages all of them disintegrated. It was obvious, therefore, that the artificial membrane formation induced by acid, initiates the process of development. This procedure was followed later by treatment with hypertonic solution of sea water, and the eggs developed into normal larvae. And now the work had begun to take its real course. Methods, one for the stimulating of the egg for membrane formation, and another for development, had been worked out for many species of eggs, and from this it was concluded that the sperm had a two-fold function of causing membrane formation and initiating development.

The next step was to determine the nature of the action of these two agencies. Membrane formation was thought to be the more important of the two because this alone was sufficient to cause the development of the eggs of some species into larvae, and the second treatment was necessary only to stimulate the rather weak effect of the first. Many agents were tried to find the nature of the substance which the sperm carried into the egg at fertilization. It was found

that anything which normally caused cytolysis (disintegration), and haemolysis of a cell would also induce membrane formation and that the essential feature of this process was a cytolysis of the cortical (outer layer) of the egg. It was found that not until the continuity of this cortical layer had been destroyed that development could begin. The most effective agencies in causing cytolysis, or the destruction of this layer, were changes in temperature, changes in osmotic pressure, certain salts, bases, and alcohols. The main feature of this process was to allow these agencies only time enough to affect the cortical layer so that the eggs could be returned to their normal medium in which development proceeded.

To show that fertilization could be brought about by any foreign material, blood serums of certain animals, and even foreign spermatozoon belonging to other animals, were used to produce this change. On the other hand, it was found that extracts from the cells or sperm of the same species in many cases would not cause membrane formation.

The fact still to be discovered was the "something" which was necessary for the development which would make continuation of cleavage possible. These facts lead to the view that the first process in egg development is a change or alteration of the surface of the egg, something in the nature of a superficial cytolysis. Cytologists have found that protoplasm is mainly an emulsion of proteins and lipoids, and that any agent which can cause liquification of these lipoids will cause cytolysis. The mechanism of this consists in dissolving the fat so that the lipid-free protein can swell or be dissolved in water. Since it has been shown that the destruction of the cortical emulsion of the egg is the essential feature in membrane formation, one must simply look for the agent in sperm which can cause the solution of the fat. This can be accomplished in some species of animals by simple mechanical stimulation since the emulsion is very weak, and can be destroyed simply by the prick of a needle. However, in other species of animals which have more durable emulsions, a chemical stimulus is necessary to cause a dissolution of fat in addition to the mechanical effect of the entering sperm.

It is generally thought by workers in this field that an additional factor is necessary to insure development, especially in the



higher forms. The idea exists that the sperm carries two separate agencies. This is substantiated by the fact that in the higher forms one is unable to insure development without the application of some agency, after the one used to produce membrane formation. For example if only the membrane forming stimulus such as buteric acid is used, the egg soon disintegrates. However, it is very probable the second factor necessary experimentally functions only as an agent to counteract the destructive effects of the first.

Ever since the original technique used by Loeb in which buteric acid followed by hypertonic sea water was used, every technique developed has in it some reagent after the one used for initiating development. The main effect of these agents has been to slow down the rate of oxidation. Thus it seems that the use of artificial stimulus is much more powerful than the natural one in causing an egg to develop, and so the increased rate of development caused by it must be retarded or disintegration will soon take place.

To see how the initiating development or membrane formation is brought about, one looks towards the change in rate of oxidation for the answer. Here it will be well to note that the main difference between resting eggs and developing eggs is that the developing eggs have a higher rate of metabolism. Whether an egg develops parthenogenetically or normally by the union of a sperm with it, it is known that if oxygen is not present, it will not develop. It is also known that oxidation increases after fertilization. This is shown as a fact by the disintegration of the egg after it has been stimulated by some artificial means, and had not some factor been used to retard this oxidation, further development would not have taken place. It is evident that an essential feature in fertilization is an increase in rate of oxidation.

Not much is known of how this process of increased oxidation is started by membrane formation, but it is thought that the lipid structure acts as a catalyzer. This is thought to induce oxidation. This theory has not been very definitely proved and it remains only as an hypothesis. At present this is as far as research in this line has proceeded, but it has done much towards bringing about a better understanding of the action of the sperm during fertilization.

The old idea that the essential process was the union of the egg and the sperm nucleus has been completely discarded. Except from the standpoint of heredity, this action is no longer important, as had been said before. The essential action of the sperm is to break the surface tension membrane, and carry into the egg some material that will cause the acceleration of oxidation, or at least release some catalyst already contained in the egg.

Much criticism of this work has been that the technique is applicable only to a few species of animals, and that a great many of them never develop very far. These criticisms may be met with the fact that during the last twenty years experiments have been worked out on many animals from echinoderms to the frog. It has even been carried out with plants and may some day be done with mammals. The chief difficulty here is that as one goes higher in the evolutionary scale the process becomes more complex. More complete plans must be fostered for the development of parthenogenetic embryos into adults.

Jacques Loeb raised frogs to the state of sexual maturity. He expressed the idea that his work could be carried out in the higher animals, and in 1915 his son, Leo, published a paper on work he had done in parthenogenesis on guinea pigs. He tried many different methods of stimulating the eggs while they were still in the ovaries, and believes that he has succeeded in initiating cleavage, being certain that parthenogenic development took place. He describes several eggs that developed as far as the formation of three germ layers, and one that showed a rudiment of a neural tube. He also noticed a placental-like structure forming in the ovary. He has photomicrographs only of the early stages of this development.

In 1929, Otto F. Kampmeir was attempting interovarian fertilization by injecting sperm into the ovaries of a living dog, and although he had no success with his original idea, he got some interesting results concerning parthenogenesis when he examined serial sections of these ovaries. He thought that he had some evidence to support Loeb's work, but when he examined them more closely in the light of the recent discoveries about ova and their follicles, he found much to disprove Loeb's work.

Another interesting aspect of the work being done in this field is the attempt to acti-

vate the sperm and cause it to develop into an embryo without the influence of the egg. Leeuwenhoek, who first discovered the sperm, thought it was the future embryo. According to his idea, the egg was simply a medium for its development, but Delage worked on it and found that if he withdrew the nucleus from an egg, and then allowed it to be fertilized, it developed normally. This does not uphold Leeuwenhoek's idea because Wilson and Lillie and others showed definitely that the protoplasm of the egg is the future embryo, and not the nucleus. The entrance of the sperm into an enucleated egg would simply cause it to proceed in its natural course of development and prevent the disintegration that would ordinarily occur. Demayer, Loeb, and Bancroft tried many experiments on the growth of sperm, and although some of their experiments show interesting results, it is still doubtful whether the sperm is capable of development similar to the egg.

In concluding, we find the results on all the work done on artificial parthenogenesis are quite limited. They do show that the process is physio-chemical, and that except for heredity, the nucleus of the sperm is rather unimportant. From facts known the egg must be considered as a potential em-

bryo which has stored in it all the properties which cause its development, and the sperm we must consider as merely a stimulating factor which sets materials in the egg free so that activation of the development of the egg can take place. In lower forms this stimulus is perhaps only the mechanical effect of the sperm piercing the egg membrane, and in higher forms it becomes more and more complex, but always to remain as a physio-chemical factor. The more complex aspect of fertilization as determined by parthenogenetic method shows a two-fold process. The first of these methods is the breaking of the surface tension membrane which motivates development, and the second is the carrying into the egg or the releasing in the egg some material which acts as a catalyst, thus increasing oxidation and thereby maintaining development. As yet the work of parthenogenesis has only been successful in developing some of the lower forms to maturity, but it is reasonable to believe that in time, with the development of methods in the laboratory for the raising of embryos which have been stimulated by parthenogenetic technique, that we shall see this field widened to include the development of higher animals.

*Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.*

## God's Power and Wisdom and the Abiding Foundations

CHRISTOPHER G. HAZARD, D.D.

THERE is a great satisfaction in learning that the voice of the Lord is powerful, that His word is almighty, that all things are possible to Him. It is a blessed thing amid the sufferings and mysteries of life to know that God moves with a sure step toward the accomplishment of His blessed purposes.

The inspired writers of the Bible rejoice in the fact that creation and providence rest upon the word of God. They agree in teaching that the universe both in its origin and in its continued being, is the expression of the divine mind. They say that the word of God is never devoid of power; that He speaks, and it is done; that He commands, and it stands fast.

In the beginning they behold Christ as the living Word of God making all things. Later they record Him during His incarnate life, healing the sick and speaking peace to the souls of sinners. When He had overcome the sharpness of death, they picture Him as declaring:

"All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." Never do they admit that His word is with weakness; it always carries power. It is like a charged wire stretching from heaven to earth, and from it men receive electric spirituality.

The Gospels tell us when the paralytic was spoken to by Christ, he rose, took up his bed, and walked; and when the man with the withered arm was commanded to stretch it out, he was empowered to obey. They record that Jesus said His words were spirit and that they were life. All this supernatural seems natural enough to those who can see it as just God acting in another sphere. It is spiritual law in a natural world. We are helped to believe in it when we contemplate how truly natural it is for God to be doing on earth just what He does in heaven.

It is a perfectly reasonable thing to believe God. He invites us by His prophet to come and reason with Him. And He begins the rea-



soning, as soon as we come, with merciful promises of the forgiveness of sins. Then He goes on with words of grace and help until He leads us by words into the knowledge of all truth and goodness.

As we hear the Lord speaking to us words that so far outvalue anything that our dearest friends could say, how is it that we, who believe others, refuse Him credence? His wonderful words of most wonderful life have been spoken to us. Day by day we give unquestioning faith to newspapers, yet refuse faith to the Author of salvation. And how the Lord must suffer from our unbelief!

Recently a young man was heard to say that he had abandoned his old beliefs; that he no longer had confidence in the Bible as a revelation of the moral law, that he had lost his respect for the social law; that he intended to do as he pleased, making his own will the standard of his life. It made a bystander tremble as he considered what the consequences of such a course must be. It makes anyone afraid as he sees the principles of religion and virtue despised and reckless self-indulgence adopted, for it means the collapse of life because of the destruction of its foundations.

What can be done for such a man? If he continues in his mood of anarchy, setting himself up against the wisdom of God and man—nothing. For a foolish person nothing can be done. We have to let him learn in the school of bitter experience. To adventure into a great wilderness without a compass is to be lost.

Think of the care with which God has laid the foundations of a good life; the mighty record of His Scriptures; the years of loving care; the lessons, duties and training of the home; the conventions of good society, and the examples of good men and women; above all and through all the sweet and sanctifying wisdom of the Church and of association with Christian people; think of these things and what they have done and are doing for generations past and present, and then try to measure the folly of a man's willfully forsaking this proved wisdom which has brought us so far to set out upon the ocean of life in a skiff and alone, having denied the only chart and compass available.

Let the new generation indeed build its own program; let there be greater and nobler achievements; this is the law of progress; but let not God's foundations be destroyed, for it is written in the Bible, "Other foundation can no man lay than is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Upon Him just rest all permanent progress and prosperity. God's wisdom and power have been the strength of the past and must remain the best hope of the future.

*Catskill, New York.*

## Man's Power and God's Power

D. J. WHITNEY, B.S.

IN California citrus districts the experiment in frost fighting is being made with some success of "wind machines" to drive frost away. A specially designed airplane propeller is mounted upon a thirty-foot tower in the center of a small orange grove and upon frosty nights this propeller is operated by a hundred-horsepower electric motor and drives the warm air from above down through the trees. The outfit rotates slowly so as to operate in a complete circle. About twenty acres can be covered in this way. The "wind" is made by human ingenuity. Compare it with the winds which the Creator causes to blow.

The cost of installation is not far from three thousand dollars. The power is great, humanly speaking—a hundred horse-power, or more than that, counting the over-load. The speed of the air as it passes through the propeller is 65 miles per hour, but this lessens rapidly as it moves onward and soon dies away.

There is man-power: a stream of air moving 65 miles an hour through what can be figured as an opening six feet in diameter—the length of the propeller—and the effect is of no importance much more than a hundred yards away.

The Creator, though, causes the air to move, not only 65 miles an hour, but occasionally one hundred or more miles per hour. He causes it to blow, not through an opening six feet in diameter, but across scores of miles of land or ocean, and the air is moved, not a few rods, but often in one storm the width of a continent and more.

Man tries in his pride to control the elements; but his efforts are puny, his success infinitesimal. "To whom then will ye liken God? . . . It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers . . ." The greatest that man can do is small indeed.

*Exeter, California*

# Christian Evidence

BISHOP H. M. DuBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

## Are the Gospels Logical as Literature?

A SPECIAL evidential value attaches to the literary quality of Scripture.

This value has not received the emphasis to which it is entitled. Unique compositional merit, indeed, has been credited to these writings; but the fact which relates their literary individuality and excellence to their theme seldom has been turned to advantage. Here cause and effect react to the end of a mutual testimony. All literature, properly so assessed, carries a witness value to itself, determined by its subject matter. In many cases, the greater value of the classic masterpieces is in their literary form and expression, which are not by-products of mechanical skill, but rather harmonious effects which comport with the message they serve; so that the manner of writing could not have been without the message; nor could the message have been in effective form without the token of its writing. Literature, in its highest office, is service of truth; and when composition departs from that service, it ceases to hold a valid claim to being literature. This is a determinative rule in all literary criticism.

To a most unusual extent, the Four Gospels exhibit the uses of literary form and expression. This, at first, an unsuspected fact, becomes a cumulative proof as the student advances in a study of particular sections and aspects of the according narratives. That which, on its face, seems a studied terseness, seeking to force the *Koine* into the last syllable of brevity, becomes an ultimate mastery of utterance and the finality of verbal form in written speech. If not elsewhere, then surely here, a miracle emerges; and in this miracle is seen the evidential value of that Scripture style which we are seeking to expound.

The Spirit himself purveyed and guided the truth residing in the facts and life treated of in the gospel drama; while, for their part, the evangelists set forth the story, as

of the seeing of their own souls. Conditions better calculated to produce literature of a transcendent type could not be conceived of. Not only was the coming of the evangel a supreme concern of the divine prescience and providence, but the record of its enactment and the letter of its perpetual preservation were ordered as of the fulness of time and the eternal fitness of the Word.

1. Were the Gospels meant to be literature in the common acceptance of that term? Most certainly they were; but not after the more technical order of literary composition. The Gospels found their own diction, shaped their own phrasings, and more than realized the ideals of human genius. In all ages, literature of the type we have described has had to wait for the human time, the human cause, and the human creator. All these, combined, have made the form, the style and the manner of world masterpieces. The *Iliad*, *Paradise Lost* and *In Memoriam* could have been written in no other times, nor by other hands, than those which met in their respective creations. The passion and movement of the Greek age made the *Iliad*; the awesome theology and reaction of the Cromwellian period centered expression in *Paradise Lost*; while the transitions and fulfillments of the Victorian times were voiced in *In Memoriam*. The heroics of Homer and Milton would have cluttered the "ringing grooves" of the Tennyson prophecy; while the lilt of the English laureate would have perished, like bubbles, on the literary seas of the older masters. Each in his place was matchless, immortal. They were as much of the order and necessity of world life as the precessions and the rule of the seasons.

It well may be said that the Spirit ordered the literary style of the Gospels. But this was through the law of necessity and likeness. The gospel is the eternal *Logos*, and the manner of its writing is not to be separated from the story itself. "A body hast thou



prepared me" goes to the concept of the written evangel, as it does to that of the Galilean Christ. The form of the evangel is a sacrament only in a lesser sense than is the body which was broken. As the Christ is not realizable without his Galilean body, neither is the evangel without the complement of its divinely ordered utterance.

2. Do the Gospels logically bear out their claim from the literary viewpoint? The answer to this is that they fully and regularly meet the standards of effectiveness established in classic writings of the highest type; and, indeed, that they reach an effectiveness beyond the ultimate attained in any profane composition. This is a uniform characteristic throughout the old and the new canons. Considering the vast reaches of time covered, and the variety of human talents involved, the result can have only the most noteworthy significance. But, as a natural sequence, the Gospels are particularly emphasized in this literary quality. Take, for example, St. Matthew's account of the birth of Christ, beginning with the first verse of the second chapter and continuing to the last verse of the same; the parable of the prodigal son, and St. John's report of the Crucifixion. From St. Matthew's story of the Birth one turns not only with a sense of its fitting brevity, nor yet the fine completeness of its inclusions, but also of the perfect balance between the language and the details of its recital. There is left no after token of lack, either in the evangel or the evangelist. As to the parable of the prodigal, not only does it carry a style beyond the perfection of the schools, but in it is exhibited an art which beggars the skill of the masters and passes into the beauty and power that reside "within the veil." To say that these art qualities were unconsciously realized is to trifle with truth in its most beautiful and apparent form. The art everywhere attained in the Scriptures is of that fulness of beauty in the divine from which the art of sculptor and painter is a far derived result. St. John's chapter on the Crucifixion is not only history within the lines of literal record; but it is more, supremely more. The crucifixion of the Christ was the reddest rose of tragedy that ever blossomed upon the thorny stem of human history. It was not martyrdom; it was not the finished letter of judicial sentence. It was sacrifice and atonement; it was appeal, and return, to the Godhood majesty

and glory veiled in the eternal mystery. It could not have been written otherwise than it was. The proof of integrity is in the reaction of the writer to the tragedy and transcendence of his story.

3. Do the Gospels meet the standard of history in description, narrative and general report of fact? That is, do they exhibit and fulfill a *motif* and purposeful integrity which are consonant with the highest form of historical literature? There is a paucity of profane history bearing directly on the major content of the Gospels; but where the two coincide the correctness of the New Testament narrative has been established. It does not need to go beyond its own claim of being an authentic record of literal fact. Both the divine and human *motif* of these writings was to identify fact in action and fulfillment. Throughout the Gospels there is neither suggestion nor hint of veiled meaning, nor of occult or double statement. The style is not that of fiction or forensic argument; it is always that of direct discourse and undeviating affirmation.

There is a literary method peculiar to classic history. Herodotus, Xenophon, Tacitus and Josephus illustrate this method in differing but effective degrees. To this method, considered from its highest classic development, the Gospels add a quality of transcendence. The accentuation of fact, living and accomplished fact, is the quintessence of gospel statement. The Gospels are preeminently a record of facts. That describes their lonely place in literature. There are no ellipses in their going, no return from their objectives, no aftermaths or glosses of their language. No qualified recitals occur from Matthew to John; but a straightforward setting down of events as they fell out, the things which most certainly came to pass, and which most certainly are believed. For this form of writing, unlike any other form of human discourse in history, philosophy or morals, there must needs be employed a particular style, one without provision for the saving clause, or the *finesse* that leaves the way open for an afterthought. Precisely this style obtains throughout the Gospels. A single material addition had been a redundancy; a material subtraction had marred the completeness of the good news.

4. Are the Gospels as literature consistent throughout their several chapters and sections? It is demonstrable that the Gospels

agree as to the facts of which they treat. The differences in their formal utterances and the variety of their approaches to the central theme of the evangel only make it certain that the personality of each writer has entered into his composition. There are *four* Evangelists, and *four* presentations of the evangel. It clearly stands out that the facts and events described by each evangelist were either personally known to him, or else an account of them had been received by him from eyewitnesses. In each case, the style, the method and the object of recital are as nearly the same as it is possible for independent responsible human talent to make them. Had the gospel materially varied as to any one of the great central facts of the birth, the ministry, sufferings, death and resurrection of Jesus the Christ it would have been valid ground for challenging the correctness of the whole story. Had the Gospels so minutely agreed in their treatment of these facts as that no color of human sentiment or syllable of differing human style could be noted, then a just ground had been established for the charge of literary collusion. By that token the writings had been put upon their defense, with serious possibilities in the outcome. But consistency is the rhythm of their story. "The prince of this world cometh, and findeth nothing in me."

5. Do the Gospels produce upon the mind of the reader the effect which is designed to

be produced by the highest forms of literature? This is the ultimate test of literary merit in all writings. Symphonies and oratorios are appraised according to their continuous effects upon audiences and individual listeners. This is that which gives to genius its meed of immortality. The tragedies of the Athenian masters which have lived to our own day got their literary rating from the effects produced upon the multitudes in their first reading at the Olympic games. In a more definite and diviner way, the prophecies of Isaiah have exhibited this quality in their hold on the mind of both the Jewish and the Christian world. In a superlative degree, the evangels compel thought, contemplation and assent because of the accordance of their form and utterance with the truth and power of the glorious gospel of the blessed God.

*Nashville, Tennessee*

When the sun goes down our hemisphere does not see it any more, but the moon sees it all night long, and the moon takes the sun's light and throws it down upon us. When the Sun of Righteousness set behind the hill of Olivet, the world saw him no more; but the church, because it is seated in heavenly places in Christ, all the night long sees the Sun, and throws the light upon the world through the Holy Ghost. The world receives what light it has from the church, and the church receives it from Jesus Christ.—*A. J. Gordon, D.D.*

## Current Scientific Discoveries

PROFESSOR GEORGE MCCREADY PRICE, M.A.

## The Futility of the Destructive Criticism

RECENTLY, Professor John Garstang, the eminent English archaeologist, announced that he had found a very remarkable confirmation of the Bible story of Jericho. In their excavations they had dug down to the level of the old city of about the time of the Exodus, and they found that the double wall around the city had been flattened out, both the inner and the outer wall having *fallen outward*. And he added, "there was nothing to explain why

the walls fell."

Thus Dr. Garstang has added another to the long list of discoveries in the Orient which have confirmed in most picturesque details the scrupulous accuracy of Old Testament topography, ethnology, and history. Scores and hundreds of discoveries have been made in those eastern lands which tend to confirm the Bible record; while not a single spadeful of earth has been overturned which has revealed any fact tending to



throw discredit upon the records of the Bible. Is it not about time that the antique theories about the "mistakes" of the Bible writers, which one finds in such reference works as the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and certain theological treatises, be relegated to the scrap heap?

We are all familiar with the idea that in our day the evolution theory is a term covering all the most important forms of opposition to the Christian religion. The biological phase of this theory is only a part of it, and by no means the oldest part. Long before the days of Darwin or Lyell, the philosophers of both England and Germany had been teaching that man started as a savage and has been developing ever since. Such Continental leaders as Comte, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel had made popular their theory of the historical development of mankind. Indeed, this theory of human development from savage or "primitive" originals was already the accepted theory about antiquity at the time Darwin's theory appeared. Little wonder then that the world eagerly accepted Darwin's theory, especially when we remember that essentially all the scientists of that day believed in the nebular hypothesis, believed in spontaneous generation, and also in this theory of the historical development of mankind from a primitive state of savagery.

No; the evolution theory did not originate with biology, nor even with geology and its long-drawn-out scheme of successive ages. It was really the philosophical and historical speculators who first taught the essential features of the development theory. And such men as Hegel and his followers gave a very cool and uncordial welcome to the first attempts to bolster up the development theory by the findings of geology and biology.

One major aspect of the general scheme now opposed to the Bible and its religion, is a form of what is usually termed "higher criticism," more properly radical or destructive criticism. Contrary to the general impression, however, this did not originate as at first dealing with the literature of the Old Testament; it started as a cynical or destructive attack on the classical literature of Greece and Rome. F. A. Wolf's notorious *Prolegomena* appeared in 1795, and discussed the background and authorship of the Homeric poems of the early Greeks. At that time those poems stood out alone as about the earliest secular products of the human

mind; no contemporary history was known of the early Homeric days: hence it was easy for a few cynical insinuations to throw doubts upon the authenticity of that early literature.

Wolf boldly taught that the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey" could never have been composed when and where tradition had placed them; for (so he declared) at that remote time the art of writing was not yet invented. He indicated that there was not the slightest real history in these poems. Several generations of romancing poets had gradually built up these productions, each adding a little to the general collection; the whole having been transmitted orally for several hundred years, until finally they were reduced to writing in the classical age of Greek history. The followers of Wolf kept up the work of further dissecting and discrediting the Homeric writings; there probably never was any such city as Troy, nor any such man as Homer; these poems were an elaborate mass of patchwork, composed by a great many authors and spread out over several hundreds of years.

I distinctly remember as a small boy that this was the commonly accepted opinion regarding these matters in the seventh and eighth decades of the nineteenth century, or before the results of excavating at Hissarlik and Mycenae were known and accepted by the literary world.

When students of the Old Testament began to apply the destructive methods of Wolf to the books of Moses, they added another idea of a somewhat earlier date. Jean Astruc, a physician of Paris who had already attained fame by a work dealing with venereal diseases at a time when such a work might be supposed to be very opportune, had published in 1753 a work entitled *Conjectures Regarding the Book of Genesis*, in which he suggested that the use of the two distinct Hebrew words for God in different parts of the book of Genesis, indicates a dual authorship for these early Hebrew writings. This "clue" of Astruc's about the dual authorship of Genesis was blended with the Wolfian theory about the art of writing having been unknown before the classic period of Greek history (say 500-600 B.C.). And thus began that merry work of dissecting and discrediting the writings of the Old Testament which is still taught as "modern scholarship" in the secular univer-

sities and the "liberal" theological seminaries of the civilized world.

One of the best little works dealing with the pretentious knowledge of the self-styled "critics," is *Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, by Prof. A. H. Sayce of Oxford. It is a small work of 127 pages. On the fly-leaf of my copy I have a note which indicates that I began to read it one evening at about 6 o'clock and finished it at fifteen minutes after midnight. I beg to give several extracts bearing upon the subject here being discussed.

The existence of two names for God is a fact which, when once pointed out, cannot be gainsaid, and Astruc's explanation of it became for "criticism" the only one. It was assumed that a difference in the use of the Divine Name must imply a difference in authorship; and when to this was added the further assumption of the late introduction of the art of writing, the future march of "criticism" was assured. Tradition, even the best attested, had to make way before it, theory was piled upon theory, and a time came at last when hardly any fragment of ancient literature had escaped the knife of the critical dissector, and the whole of ancient history, as it had been handed down to us before the age of Cyrus or the capture of Rome by the Gauls, was wiped out with a sponge. (p.27).

Again I quote from Professor Sayce:

For more than half a century after the publication of Wolf's *Prolegomena* the assumption of the late use of writing for literary purposes was one which no one who pretended to critical scholarship ventured to dispute. Among the Greeks, it was assumed, it did not go back beyond the sixth century before our era; among the Hebrews only the more conservative critics allowed that it might have been known in the age of Solomon. But even this concession was not universally admitted, and Biblical criticism ended by denying the pre-exilic origin of the larger part of the Old Testament literature. The early Israelites could not read or write: how then could a mature literature such as we find in the Old Testament have come into existence at an early date? (p.28).

I need not attempt even to outline the story of how archaeology has changed all this tomfoolery. With the Rosetta stone as the key, the hieroglyphics made it clear that the Egyptians were a highly civilized and even a skilled literary people a thousand years before the time of Moses. With the Behistun rock as a key, the cuneiform tablets and monuments of Babylonia opened up a new world of knowledge. It soon became apparent that mortgages and deeds and extensive diplomatic correspondence were familiarly used by all the higher classes of those ancient nations, that all the peoples of the Orient contained multitudes of scribes and readers. Centuries before Abraham, both

Egypt and Babylonia were full of schools and libraries and all that these institutions imply. As Sayce tersely puts it, "The Babylonia of the age of Abraham was a more highly educated country than the England of George III."

But "criticism," which it should be remembered is the literary and historical aspects of that anti-Biblical philosophy of our day most conveniently summed up under the term "evolutionism," made a long and stubborn fight against the facts which were being brought to light by the rising science of archaeology. As late as 1862, Sir George Cornwall Lewis, eminent statesman and man of letters, spoke of the research work being done in Babylonia and Egypt as "worthless" and "uncertain;" while ten years later an eminent German scholar, Professor Nöldeke, declared that the results obtained from Babylonia and Assyria had "a highly suspicious air."

The students of the Greek classics were slow to admit the new views of the ancient world, but it is the Biblical "critics" who have most persistently clung to their out-of-date theories about the peoples and times of the Bible. In essentially all the big reference works still used by the enquiring students in ordinary universities and in the modernistic theological seminaries, theories are treated as established which the results of archaeology have long ago completely discredited. Some wag has said that it takes about ten years for scientific discoveries to find their way into school textbooks; it would seem to take a full half-century for any substantial corrections in "critical" theories to find their way into the books used by "modernistic" schools.

In geology and biology, also, we see the same stubborn resistance to the new discoveries which tend to discredit the theories started by Lyell and Darwin. Great numbers of important discoveries have been made in embryology, in geology, and in general biology which tend to make the theory of organic evolution intellectually impossible. Henry Fairfield Osborn and others are trying to save their general theory of man's animal origin by openly admitting that man cannot be a descendant of the ape, but of some animal still lower than the ape. Such tactics are only an intellectual smoke screen, in an effort to cover a partial retreat from an impossible position.



Just as Cornewall Lewis and Nöldeke and the other "critics" fought a continuous reaction battle against the victorious facts of archaeology, so we may expect the advocates of evolutionism, who have already made it an intellectual "orthodoxy" which is established in all the chief educational institutions of the world, will show a very stubborn resistance to the spread of these new discoveries.

What a strange situation. How often have we been told that the pursuit of truth for its own sake is the most noble occupation of the human mind. Huxley went one better than this in saying that "the foundation of morality is to have done once for all with lying, to give up pretending to believe that for which there is no evidence."

1. But there is no evidence for the origin of matter except by creation.
2. There is no shred of evidence for any other origin of life than by a real creation.
3. There is no evidence for the origin of any of the distinct "kinds" of life except by a real creation.
4. There is no evidence for any other or-

igin of man than by a real creation.

5. There is no evidence of the late date of composition for the first books of the Bible, no shred of reliable evidence that they were not written at the time and in the manner so long believed regarding them.

Why not follow Huxley's stern admonition and give up believing that for which there is no evidence? With all the facts now arrayed against them, the modernistic evolutionists are in about the same position as was the man with a settled hatred of Dr. Fell. "I do not like you, Dr. Fell; The reason why I cannot tell; But one thing sure I know full well, I do not like you, Dr. Fell."

In the last analysis this is really all there is behind the wide popularity of the anti-Biblical theories. A certain old man who lived in the days of Nero explained the situation very well when he said, "The carnal mind is enmity against God." This offers the best explanation of the present situation that I can conceive of.

But again I ask, why not give up pretending to believe that for which there is no evidence?

*Berrien Springs, Michigan*

## The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A., B.D.

## The Faith of Archbishop Soederblom of Sweden

IF the names given by Christian parents to their children at baptism are rightly regarded as prayers, the name of the recently deceased Archbishop of Sweden was well chosen. Nathan—for that is his baptismal name—means "Given." He was a gift of God in a special sense. Since his death, July 12, at Upsala, someone has said, if Protestantism wanted a pope here would have been its first. More correctly it could be said, since the Reformation Archbishop Soederblom was the most oecumenical and outstanding leader in Protestantism. This adds interest to the question in these days, "Was he a modernist or a conservative?"

It is unnecessary to go into details regard-

ing his biography. Newspapers and magazines have informed us on these matters. However, I shall touch the essentials of his life in order that we might the better understand his faith.

He was born of devout Christian parents. His father was a pastor of distinguished ability who regarded his highest calling to be the preaching of the Gospel. In other words his background was that of Christian piety plus Christian scholarship.

He began Latin with his father in the parsonage at the age of five and finished his formal education at the University of Upsala at the age of twenty-eight. He was a born student. He died a student. His hobby

was research work in religion. Many a young student theologian today has a penchant for sociology; Nathan Soederblom as such wrote his first book on the Reformation. The last of the "Universals," Goethe, at the age of thirteen was attempting to write in seven languages; Archbishop Soederblom spoke eight! (Some say he was at home in ten). The writer heard him preach a sermon in chaste English in Old Swedes Church, Wilmington, Delaware. He himself conversed with the Primate in German on the occasion of his visit to this the oldest Protestant Church in America. On the altar side of this historic building still cling some of the letters of a Latin saying. The Archbishop read the saying completely as though it were a modern proverb.

He was a born leader. He simply became head of whatever he took part. As a student he naturally became head of the student body. As a pastor he naturally became the chief pastor. As a Swedish pastor he naturally became Archbishop of Sweden. As a Protestant leader he naturally became the head of the Protestant Church. In a time, war shocked, and torn apart by a pagan nationalism, he became naturally the recipient of the World Peace Prize—the first won by a clergyman—and on the basis, not of a secular pacifism, but on the basis of the principles of the Prince of peace!

Is it necessary to say that for seven years he served the Swedish Church in Paris, that for two years he lectured as professor in the University of Leipzig (Positive), that the established Church of England regarded him as one of its own, that the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople made him an honorary member of the institution of music, that the Patriarch of Alexandria and the Metropolitan of Malabar and India attended the assembly at Stockholm for his sake, that even Rome could not deny his "Apostolic Succession"? It was largely the fine ecumenical spirit of the Christ in this man of God that helped so mightily to win the love and esteem of the Baptists of England and the Methodists of America at Stockholm.

Great emphasis has been laid upon the word "naturally." It is meant in the Pauline sense "I am what I am by the grace of God." Nathan Soederblom was a gift of God in Christ Jesus to the Twentieth Century.

Now that he is no more in the flesh there have arisen voices who claim him as a liberal, who awaken the impression that he had broken with the historic Christianity of Holy Scriptures, that he was an outstanding leader of the Modernists, true not radical, but one of them.

That is false—it is a glaring misrepresentation. It manifests either a deliberate attempt to distort the facts or it is, as is so often the case, a superficial understanding of a great and devout faith. We want to believe it is the latter.

What was the faith of the late Archbishop Nathan Soederblom of Sweden?

The first Lutheran World Convention (1923) was held in the historic city of Eisenach, Germany, under the majestic shadow of the Wartburg Castle, from which Luther gave to the world the New Testament in the language of the people. As a witness to its faith the first thing accomplished was to adopt unanimously the following of three resolutions:

The Lutheran World Convention acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only source and the infallible norm of all church doctrine and practice, and sees in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, especially in the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, a pure exposition of the Word of God.—(Page 15 from the official English Minutes of The Lutheran World Convention 1923. The United Lutheran Publication House, Phila., Pa.)

Archbishop Soederblom gave his hearty "yea" to this article of faith.

After Bishop Ihmels of Saxony made his address of welcome, the first in order from the many nations represented to respond was the Primate of Sweden. I shall quote a few of his remarks:

With profound gratitude in our hearts we lift our voices in praise to God for His grace in sending the prophet Martin Luther to reveal to us again the atoning work of His Son. . . Luther is the greatest evangelist the Church of Christ has known since New Testament times. . . Luther's doctrine of faith is often interpreted as a strong psychological effect which a man produces in himself. This is utterly false. Luther himself wrote in his first exposition of the Lord's Prayer: "Proud-spirited saints do more harm than any other people on earth, etc." We are nothing. We are poor, weak, vessels with impure content, or at best with no content at all. But the empty hand of trust is filled by God's mercy in Christ Jesus. . . Luther's special mission lay in the fact that he revealed again, as no other since the days of St. Paul had done, the boundless depths of the love of God in the Crucified One. And this evangelical doctrine of the salvation alone through the grace of God it is our



mission to keep forever pure and whole. Nothing else can assure us of forgiveness and consolation; nothing else can assure us of eternal life. . .

So therefore we gather *under* the name of Luther but by no means *in* the name of Luther. Rather do we gather in the Name of Jesus Christ. The Word of God is our only strength. No worldly means nor human calculations will suffice. The Word that Luther brought to light again, the Word of Revelation, above all, the Word became flesh, the incarnated Logos,—this is our sufficiency. By the grace of God we should also incarnate that Word in our hearts and lives, because that Word is the Will of God.—*Pages 23-26 from the above Minutes.*

Six years later (1929) the Second Lutheran World Convention was held at Copenhagen, Denmark. At the opening session, after Archbishop Soederblom had presented the greetings of His Majesty, King Gustavus of Sweden, he read a scholarly paper on the subject, "Luther as a Christian Personality and His Significance for Northern Europe." Here are a few excerpts:

Luther had no idea of setting up a new Communion. He sharply rejected all sectarianism. In his Greater Catechism he acknowledges the Church to be "a congregation on earth of saints only under one Head, Christ; by the Holy Ghost called together into one faith, one mind, one understanding; with divers gifts but agreeing in love without sects or schism." The Church to him was *one*. He knew that he was continuing the fellowship of the Saviour and His apostles more truly than his adversaries. Consequently it is a heresy to date our Church from the 16th Century. On the contrary, it is Apostolic Christianity continued through many vicissitudes and combinations during the following centuries.

Within this *One Church* the Archbishop then names those of commonly accepted historical communions. He quotes in full Luther's well known explanation to the Third Article regarding the Church and the working of the Holy Spirit within it. For only he who clings to historic Christianity can confess the following:

I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him; but the Holy Ghost has called me through the Gospel, etc.

I recall nowhere a finer statement of the meaning of historical continuity within the bounds of Christianity than these words from the address of the Archbishop:

Luther takes up the classical documents of elementary instruction. His Little Catechism continues what the Ancient Church and the Middle Ages had taught and done. Luther was come not to break up but to fulfill—obedient to the Master. His piety as well as his psychological grip are shown by the fact that Luther bases his teaching on the main items of the Faith which had of yore

been taught by the Church, viz., the Ten Commandments from Moses' time, the Lord's Prayer which Jesus gave to His disciples, and the summary of the ancient Church of its faith in Father, Son and Spirit. He kept to the classical tradition of the Church. An inevitable objectivity determined him. Was Christianity to be stated in terms, the starting point must be sought in its most widespread and time-honored documents. The same rule must be observed this very day.

In conclusion the Primate of Sweden said:

May the Word live and work among us; God's Word and promises shall stand fast. The Word became flesh and dwelt among us. . . Shall we not, in our different languages, confess our faith in our Lord together, using Luther's words?

All arising, led by Archbishop Soederblom, confessed:

I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord;

Who has redeemed me a lost and condemned creature, secured and delivered me from all sins, from death, and the power of the devil, not with silver and gold, but with his holy and precious blood, and with His innocent sufferings and death; in order that I might be His, live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and blessedness: even as He is risen from the dead, and lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true.—*The Minutes of Lutheran World Convention 1926, pages 16-24.*

Was Nathan Soederblom a liberal? The liberals would have us to think so. It is but the repetition of the old story: how the Modernists do err! Dr. Sloan has pointed this out in his brilliant article, "Is There Peril in the Worship of Jesus?" For here a few inexcusable historical distortions were corrected. Again in the August edition of *CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE* Dr. Sloan has presented historical facts in "checking up" on a seminary professor who seems to have a grudge against historic Christianity.

If Archbishop Soederblom ever had liberal conceptions, as some inform us, it must have been during his youthful years due to his fervent desire for Christian unity. However, the fact stands: continued, matured study as a thorough-going scholar soon corrected this seeming tendency. In the August 1st edition of *The Literary Digest* an article entitled, "A Spiritual Viking," concluded with the words of an eminent Lutheran clergyman of New York, who knew the Archbishop for twenty years, as follows:

The greatest satisfaction with him, however, finally lay in this—that all knowledge centered in Christ.

Wilmington, Delaware

## THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.  
L. M. HARGETT, D.D.  
ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D.  
MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.  
WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.  
REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK  
THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

### Where are the Dead?

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., LL.D.

*If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead—Philippians 3:11.*

IN approaching this most interesting subject we need to begin with the Biblical conception of life and death. For the Scripture, life is relationship with God, and death is His divine judgment upon the futility of life that cuts itself off from Him. To stand oneself thus cut off, independent, self-sufficient, is the very genius of sin; and the genius of Christian character is precisely the opposite. If sin is self-sufficient and self-glorious, then Christian character is consciously self-insufficient, and dependent upon the completing supernatural resource of the Saviour.

In an address recently given in the interest of atheism and published by the Four-A Society of New York, Joseph Lewis said, "There are no bending knees in atheism; no supplication; no prayers; no sacrificial redemption; no divine revelation; no Christ; no Saviour." The significant thing in this statement, from our point of view, is that these atheistic negations can only seem attractive to a self-sufficient, self-glorious heart; and atheism is in fact not an intellectual conclusion or confusion so much as it is a heart attitude of self-sufficiency and self-assertion. Atheism is thus seen to be a deep moral delinquency as false, perhaps even more false, than impurity and stealing. We need to have steadily in mind our fundamental truth: that the genius of sin is self-sufficiency, and that the genius of Christian character is self-insufficiency that entrusts itself to God for completing.

It is of the utmost importance that we get this truth. There are two conceivable interpretations of human life. For one view, man is men. He is a multitude of independent, self-sufficient individuals, each one free from all others, and cooperating with others only

to the degree that he may choose so to relate himself. For the other view, man is man. He is a unity of life in which is included the whole totality of personal beings both human and divine. We belong to each other. We belong to the deity; and save as life fulfills this whole vast sweep of relationships it is both false and futile.

The second of these two ideas is the Biblical conception of life, and in it, as we can easily see, death stands as God's judgment built into the very frame of things upon the falsity and futility of the self-sufficient motive.

The Roman Catholic theology has a very profound view of man's being. It is that he is at once natural and supernatural. His natural equipment made him the head of creation. His supernatural equipment made him capable of holiness and the fellowship of God. Conscious self-insufficiency, a divine endowment, and dependence on the divine was thus built into the very plan of man's being. In his supernatural equipment, vitally related to God, man was potentially immortal, being capable of infinite life, but the choice of self-sufficiency robbed him of his glory. The Holy Spirit withdrew His inner illumination and left man to grope in the darkness and disappointment of his natural helplessness. The final consequence was death: God's solemn expression of judgment upon the futility of life that is cut off, that stands in the littleness of self, alone, meaningless, worthless.

Death, then, is the final consequence of man's choice of self-sufficiency, that is, of sin. By his choice of self he loses that supernatural completing which was his by dependence upon God. He sinks back to the beast and dies like the beast. In himself alone he is incapable of immortality.

Salvation by faith in the all-sufficient grace of God in Jesus Christ stands as the



complete reversal of that first sin choice which has darkened history. At the beginning man chose self-sufficiency. Then he discovered its consequences in groping futility, disappointment and death. His self-insufficiency is pressed upon him in tragic experience; at last, out of the depths of his self-despair, he reverses himself, he turns to God, and cries with supreme desire

Thou O Christ art all I want,  
More than all in Thee I find.

Here begins a new vital contact with the creative life of God. The helpless sinner, disillusioned of his self-sufficiency, is made a "new creature" in Christ Jesus. He is "born from above." New life is in him. It manifests itself immediately in new motives, new affections; and then later, at the very moment of mortality, this new life lifts the believer free from death and out into the glory of God.

In Philippians 3:11 Paul seems to describe this deliverance which comes at the moment of mortal pain. He speaks of attaining unto an "out-resurrection from among the dead." He is evidently not thinking of the general resurrection, for to this he does not need to attain since it is all inclusive. The resurrection of which he is thinking, being a goal to be attained, must consequently belong to a group of the dead only. It is an "out-resurrection" that separates believers upon Christ from the self-sufficient and impenitent. It is a separating of certain spirits out from among the dead.

There is no clear statement in Scripture of the state of the dead. The old world, both pagan and Jewish, conceived of it as a dim, shadowy, joyless existence. The Psalmist cries, "In Sheol there is no remembrance of Thee" (Psalm 6:5), and he therefore prays to be delivered from it. But Christians are not separated from God in death; they are definitely united to Him: consequently, in the full sense of the word, they cannot experience death. The mortality that comes to them cannot be more than the empty pod of which the dark power has been withdrawn. Three times over, toward the end of His earthly life, Jesus gave expression to the conviction that death for the Christian had lost its power. When He stood before the grave of Lazarus He cried, "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth

and believeth in me shall not die." Later in His upper room discourse with His disciples, He said to them, "Do not let your hearts be troubled; believe in God and in me also believe. In my Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." And once more as He hung upon the cross, when the penitent robber believed upon Him He said, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Evidently then, believers do not fully experience death. They possess a relation to Christ which empties mortality of its power. At death He comes to take them to Himself. He brings them life in the very midst of their mortal pain and before earth is done, glory brightens on the view.

This conception of that a believer experiences a quickening of his spirit life at the moment of mortality not only provides a satisfying interpretation for Paul's remarkable text, but it fully interprets also the powerful and triumphant words of Jesus. In the very midst of mortality the spirits of believers are clothed with new and nobler powers. They do not die; but as death draws near they rise. At the very threshold of the grave new capacities equip their trembling consciousness. Life opens up toward the Infinite. That sense of the reality and presence of God and Christ which came to them in conversion becomes richer and fuller. Their spirits are not left naked but are clothed upon with heavenly powers. But self-sufficient and impenitent spirits experience death. They are unclothed. They are stripped naked. They are left alone with their consciousness of self and the flame of their memories. They are isolated, desolate, futile.

Paul has worked out precisely this contrast between the death of the believer and of the impenitent in 2 Corinthians 5:1-8. He speaks there of believers being clothed upon with their house which is from heaven, and of others who are simply unclothed and left naked. The apostle's language is apt to seem somewhat unclear because he is making use of a Hebrew figure of speech, which is not common in English. In Paul's day, however, it was a common idea to speak of man's spirit as being clothed with certain powers as with a house, a tent, or a garment.

Again, it was customary to speak of those who had been stripped of such powers as

having been left naked. Thus, to illustrate, the Rabbis used to say Israel was clothed or equipped with a holy house or garment when it received the Law at Mt. Sinai, and that it was stripped and left naked when it sinned against God in the worship of the golden calf (Clark ad. loc.). The house or garment, then, means the powers of one's life; and to be left naked is to lose those powers without having them replaced by others. With this understanding let us turn to the text of the Epistle and paraphrase it for ourselves.

For we know that if the faculties by which our spirits are clothed in this life be taken from us, new powers will be given us which are now prepared in heaven; powers which will open to us the glory of eternal life. As Christian men, then, we look forward to the moment of mortality without fear. We will never know that naked loneliness, which is the sinners' doom. Rather death will be for us an experience of enlarging. In the very midst of it we will receive a new equipment for life by which death will be swallowed up in glory. This is the will of God for us. He wrought us for this very purpose, and already in the precious experience of Christian certainty He has given to us a dim foretaste of that glory which shall be ours. Therefore we are always confident and even expectant as we anticipate mortality, knowing that while the powers of our present earthly life yet clothe us we cannot experience the full glory of the heavenly vision. We are confident, I say, and expectant, waiting to put off our earthly equipment, that receiving our heavenly, we may attain unto the full vision and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The moment of mortality then for the Christian is not death, but life; for out of the midst of death he attains unto an "out-resurrection from among the dead." His spirit is never left naked. When he is losing his earthly powers he is gaining heavenly. When city streets and houses grow dimmer, Christ grows fuller and clearer. When the world at last is past, then Christ is seen filling the whole horizon of life. The believer's reversal of sin's first choice of self-sufficiency, in the choice of self-insufficiency and trust, is fulfilled. Christ has become his all-in-all.

Death thus brings to men one or the other of two possible experiences. Either it brings

them the isolation of their spirits, or else it brings them the powerful, abounding, tender, sublime revelation of Christ. There is a beautiful truth here. The experience of conviction of sin, in which the believer gives up his illusion of self-sufficiency and throws himself upon the grace of Christ, is the nearest he ever comes to death. At that moment his Lord is revealed. He becomes inwardly aware of that sublime Presence; and from that moment on through all eternity his life forever advances. Browning's powerful lines,

Grow old along with me,  
The best is yet to Be

is not adequate to the wealth of this Christian truth. Paul stated it better when he cried: "All things are yours," and then included death in the catalogue. Death for the believer has been emptied. In the very moment of its coming it is overwhelmed. Eternal life engulfs it. Where the dark had been, Christ stands, the believer's joy, his glory, and his crown.

Professor Curtis used to liken this period of communion with the Saviour which occupied time between death and the general resurrection to a student's finishing course in the university. In the immediate presence of Christ our souls are finished for eternal life. Earth's purpose of self-entrusting to Christ rids believers of the ruinous choice of self; but it is only in the intermediate ages and by our intimate fellowship with Christ that our individualities are cleansed from the prejudices and misconceptions that still on earth beset us. On earth we are quarried out of the rock for heaven; but it is in the long fellowship of our souls with Christ that we are perfectly fitted to the temple of His eternal purpose. In the resurrection as in the building of Solomon's temple there will be no sound of hammer or chisel; but each living stone will come forth finished, fit, perfectly adjusted to the perfect whole.

The more I study the book of Revelation, the more I am inclined to see this period of the soul's fellowship with Christ in some of its triumphant portraitures. How rich with meaning would become that dramatic description of the White Conqueror leading on in Triumph the multitude of His redeemed, if it were to be understood as a description of the conquering march of Christ and His saints down the ages of history. Christ's Kingdom does not wait to begin. It has be-



gun. Our risen Lord is now upon His throne. His saints are with Him. In a vastly richer sense they are reigning with Him, now, as all down the centuries He turns and overturns, bringing ever nearer the final conquest of every evil thing.

In 1 Corinthians 15:23 and following, Paul describes the succession of events that consummate God's redemptive purpose. First, it is Christ's victory over death; second, it is the general resurrection at His coming in which he may mean to note a certain precedence of believers over the finally impenitent. Then comes the judgment and the end. Sin is revealed, blasted, banished forever, and the triumphant multitude who are perfected and united in Christ are lifted into the glory of the eternal unity of God. Paul describes this consummating event as the delivering up of the Kingdom by the Son to the Father. Christ's mediatorial reign is finished; His conquest of sin and death are complete. All things are one. Humanity is one. History is one. The whole vast spectacle of years with its joy and shame is redeemed and unified in Christ. He carries it all up with Him into the life of the Triune God. It is this consummating experience to which Jesus referred in His prayer of holy Thursday, when He cried, "Father, I will that all these whom Thou hast given me should be with me where I am" (in the fulness of the divine presence) "that they might behold my glory which Thou hast given me: that Thou hast loved me before the foundation of the world."

However we may conceive of the outward setting of eternal life—and, for me, it is as objective and tangible as life in this world has been—the goal of the ages is to know the unity and love of God. To will as God wills; to feel as God forever feels; to experience the fulness of His unbounded holy love; to realize the depths and reaches of this love expressed in all the spaces and in all the stars, and in all the innumerable relationships of personal life, this is the crown. And at last it will be realized.

At last the universe will be one. At last there will rise everywhere one vast *Amen* to the holy unity of God. It will include not only nature in its wide orderliness of law-abiding force. It will include man. It will include every center of personal consciousness and purpose within the bounds of creation. It will all be united to make one vast music,

one perfect harmony. And in this *Unity*, this deep *Amen*, this *Unbounded Harmony* the glory of the Creator will be consummated, and the blessedness of the creature will be made full.

But that final crowning cannot come until history is complete, until all the dead are raised, and judgment is finished. Nor is our present thought of that final noble event. It is the period in between, when earth has ended and glory has not yet fully begun, we would explore. Where are the dead? we ask. Answer: The sinful dead are experiencing the futility of their choice of self-sufficiency. They are alone in that "outer-darkness" of which Jesus spoke. They are unclothed, naked, isolated, desolate, futile. But the redeemed have been clothed upon. They have received their immortal house from heaven. They have been snatched out of death in the very moment of mortality. They have attained unto the "out-resurrection from among the dead."

Is not this the very experience of the saints as all down the years their triumphs have been witnessed and preserved for us?

Dr. Wilbur Fisk, President of Connecticut Wesleyan, was in his mortal extremity, eagerly waiting for release. He was so weak his sentences and even his words came in gasps, yet his mind was vastly exalted. He said,

Vain human reasoners often tell us that the soul and the body will go down together to the dust, because the spirit is depressed when the body is; but it is not true. These clogs of earth have often retarded the operations of my mind, and been as so many barriers to its activity. But I now feel a strength of soul and an energy of mind, which this body, though afflicted and pained, cannot impair.

The soul has an energy of its own; and so far from my body pressing my soul down to the dust, I feel as if my soul had almost power to raise the body upward and bear it away; and it will at last, by the power of God, effectually draw it to heaven, for its attractions are thitherward.

A little later, addressing his wife, he said:

Our parting will not be long. Time seems to me like a mere point. Eternity swallows up all. . . . Imagination's utmost stretch cannot measure eternity. O, my dear, build your hopes on nothing but Jesus, and him crucified! The doctrines of the cross only have efficacy to raise you to heaven, where I trust we shall soon meet. O, then shall we be in possession of those beauties which charm the angels, and bind them to the throne of God.

To a friend who came in on the day next to his last of earth, asking if he knew him, he replied: "Yes. Glorious hope!" and these

were almost his last words. Certainly we can see here the beginning of his "out-resurrection from among the dead."

And is not this same precious hope and promise the explanation of the shouts of the martyrs? Stephen, the proto-martyr, is bruised, bleeding, dying. He kneels upright and gazes into the arching blue. It seems to part before his eyes. He sees the glorified Christ in whom he had trusted. He sees Him sweeping down from the eternal throne to receive His own. What is this experience? Is it vision? No, it is sight; sight by eyes more powerful than these of our flesh. Grace had enveloped him. His heart had become a flame of perfect love. The words of his sweet Christian prayer still echo across the years: "Lord Jesus lay not this sin to their charge!" Yes this is more than faith. It must be, it is experience. It is man's supernatural exaltation. It is the divine gift of our house which is from heaven.

If Stephen's experiences were isolated we might doubt it; but just such triumphs, just such martyr shouts, fill the Christian centuries. Ten thousand thousand of our sainted dead have passed so amid hovering glories. Their exultant words reflect a bit of the light of their heavenly resurrection lent to earth for a moment as they pass. It is the fulfillment of Christ's promise, "I will come again, and I will receive you unto myself."

Hallelujah! death is vanquished! They who believe upon Jesus never will experience its lonely gloom.

What mighty words were those which our Lord spoke at the sepulchre of Lazarus: "I am the resurrection and the life . . . He that liveth and believeth in me shall never die!" Death is vanquished. By His incarnation, death, and resurrection, Christ has despoiled it of its power. For men who are living in unity with their triumphant Lord it is only an empty pod. Already when first we knelt in faith at His feet His almighty power laid hold upon us, and in our mortal moment it will be fully revealed, lifting us clear of death and equipping us with the power of an endless life.

## The Bible a Treasure

The Bible is the treasure of the poor, the solace of the sick, the support of the dying. While other books may amuse and instruct in a leisure hour, it is the peculiar triumph of *that* book to create light in the midst of darkness, to alleviate the sorrow which admits no other alleviation, to direct a beam of hope to the heart, which no other topic of consolation can reach, while guilt, despair, and death vanish before its holy inspiration.—*Robert Hall*.

What one's attitude would have been toward the crucified Christ is indicated by one's attitude toward those who are persecuted for their principles today.—*John Andrew Holmes*.

# For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, B.A.

## Briand \*

ONE of the greatest characters of our modern world is Aristide Briand. He has been fittingly described as a "man of peace." To him, as to no other, must be credited the greater amount of constructive pacific work in the world.

He was a peasant, born in Nantes, on the Loire and was brought up in St. Nazaire, by the sea. It was his boyhood ambition to

be a sailor and brave the daring waves. His Uncle, a pilot, filled his mind with enchanting tales. This fond dream, however, was ruined with the tragic death of his uncle. The sight of that dead body—those boots dripping with the sea made such a life forever distasteful to him.

That childhood dream was not to come to naught. There was to be a perfect substitution. To adjust sails before the tempest; to execute a quick movement at a critical moment—all of these were fulfilled, one

\* *Briand, Man of Peace*, by Valentine Thomson.



way or another, through his stormy political life. Briand, after all, became a pilot.

A man by the name of Gentry took an interest in this lad who was to play such an important role in the drama of peace. He introduced him to the classics; to the Greeks and Romans; to the Iliad, Odyssey; to the heroes of burning Troy. Sitting by the seaside he said to Briand: "Listen to the tumult of the waters. No voice can shout that down. Listen to the endless commotion of the world. Watch the waves breaking on the sand. The meaning of that, my boy, is unfathomable."

Briand never forgot his old teacher. Later in life when he had been appointed the Minister of Public Instruction he presented the first Legion of Honor to the man who saw in a boy the spark of genius, and fanned that spark by the scintillation of his own mind until that spark became a flame and is now illuminating the world. Referring to the revolutionary notions of his youth he said, "I was a bit extravagant, ready for everything. I had a turbulent nature that time had not yet cooled down." However, we cannot forget the words of Clemenceau, "I think nothing of those who before twenty are not revolutionists."

After finishing law school in Paris he decided to build his career in Saint Nazaire, among his own people. He wanted to devote himself to new ideas that were seething in his mind. Upon his arrival at home he turned to the labor leaders, recruited from the factories, and tried to understand their problems and be their friend. It was in Saint Nazaire he undertook his propaganda for the organization of the legal right to strike. There was no liberal newspaper in the district, so he started *The Western Democracy*. For purposes of economy he became, as occasion demanded, editor, compositor, pressman, and printer's devil.

In the very beginning his court behavior revealed his skill as a strategist. So great did his reputation become as a lawyer that Clemenceau declared, "If I stole the tower of Notre Dame I would want Briand to defend me."

It seemed to be the genius of Briand to unite diverse forces. As a young editor and labor advocate we see him uniting the diverse elements and in the face of terrific opposition establish a united labor party and win for the workman the legal right to strike. In Parliament he is a political pacifier. He unites the diverse factions and

works for the construction of a better nation. We see him at his best in international life. He has dedicated his life to the purpose of uniting diverse nations and bringing about an international agreement to obliterate war as a national policy.

Even in the first gloomy days of the war when the dark clouds were hanging heavy over the battlefields of France; when the name of the victor had not been spoken, and no one knew who it would be—he was thinking of a new Europe, of a League of Nations, of keeping faith with the dead.

Now, when we look back over the last few years, we see this new apostle building a beautiful staircase to peace; planting the germ of an olive tree on the banks of Lake Locarno. We see the first shoot bursting through the soil, and hear Briand begging the nations not to crush it; knowing that at last when it has reached its full growth the people of the world will love to rest under its shade.

When he appeared in London to speak before the celebrated assembly that would ratify the treaty of Locarno among other things he said, "Among the mass of letters that I have received personally, there is one that has touched me deeply. That letter alone would make me feel that this act is the most important one of my whole life. It is a simple letter from an unknown woman lost in the crowd. She says to me, 'Allow a Mother to congratulate you. At last I am going to be able to look at my children without that terrible apprehension of war and to love them with security.'"

He left that dramatic assembly to rush to the Parliament in Paris, and facing the apparent defeat that infernal French politics so frequently brings, he said what will long live in the minds of Frenchmen, "You speak of the German people. Do you think that I went without emotion to that rendezvous on the side of the lake where I was to meet the German delegates? I went there and they came here and we spoke together as Europeans. It is a new language that we will all have to learn. France does not belittle herself in taking a part in discussions that prepare Europe for tomorrow. Can you imagine France sitting aside in a corner wrapped up in her victory and looking at the people belligerently? Impossible. Can you imagine such a France? Never. In signing the agreements she has remained herself, the France of yesterday and the France of tomorrow."

Why was he instrumental in a Briand-Kellogg Pact when fifteen nations outlawed war? Why does he hope, dream, work for a United States of Europe? He does it because he believes in peace. He believes human nature is capable of achieving it. He does it because of the black veils worn by the widows, of the pains of broken-hearted mothers, of the terror for the little children left to them. Like black ghosts they haunt him. Why does he do it? Why does he keep on in spite of terrific opposition? The answer is found in this one of many incidents. One day a delegation of young men of different nations, all of whom had been wounded, came to see him. Every one bore on his body the proofs of some terrible injury. One of them was an Austrian who had been led into the room by his wife, his eyes staring vaguely and empty of life and light. Both his arms were gone and his efforts to walk were pitiful. He went close to Briand and said in a voice shaking with emotion, "Sir, don't let yourself be stopped in your work. We are five-million mutilated men. In their names, I, blind, I, without arms, a mere fragment of a man, but who

at least has the right to speak, I come to you to tell you that our hearts are with you, for God's sake, go on."

## The Institutes of John Calvin

THE "Institutes of John Calvin" were completed when he was twenty-six years of age. They have never been essentially altered but have remained for almost three hundred years an impregnable, complete system. They have formed the characters of great men and changed the destinies of people. It was their discipline that moulded William the Silent, Cromwell, Knox. They saved the Dutch Republic, raised England to be the greatest power in Europe, founded the commonwealth of America, turned Scotland into a Puritan country, assisted at the birth of capitalism, were present at that of Democracy, gave place to the Netherlands and to Scotland after 120 years of civil turmoil and persecution. They have affected the lives of every class of people and to this day the edifice of the system has never fallen.

# Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, M.A.

## Topic for October 11, 1931 The Question—The Analysis of Prayer

*Scripture—Matthew 6:5-8; James 4:3.*

THERE is a distinct difference between talking about prayer and praying. One is technical, mechanical and unavailing, the other is experimental and helpful to the nth degree. It is one thing to know all about prayer but it is quite another thing to pray. In this case, knowledge is not virtue. Action becomes virtue. The purpose of these studies is not to have men know more, but to have men pray more. It is an undisputable fact that very few Christians are praying, and yet prayer is the power that looses the forces of the Infinite in this universe.

For eight years, I have personally sought to learn how to pray. Through many books, principles have been laid down, through the Bible, examples have been received, and through practice, experience has been enjoyed. But still, though conscious of having learned much, the subtle feeling creeps upon one that only little is known. To experience a consuming passion, such as kept Fletcher in his

room praying a whole night in every week and caused him to stain the walls of his room with the breath of his prayers and prompted him when he met you to say, "Do I greet you praying?" is seldom known today. To pray for an hour or two every morning as Luther did and as Wesley made his daily custom, is not the common practice today. And yet to some degree, we have attained to a knowledge of prayer and to a practice of prayer but not to the extent that we must reach.

It is evident that the world needs something to bring it to Christ, that the Church needs something to give it power to bring the world to Christ, and that the Christians, after having come to Christ, need some power to keep them. If prayer is what the Bible says it is, if it is what these books say it is, and is what our experience tells us it is, then prayer will meet this need. At the same time, there is no more difficult task for the preacher than that of attempting to get people to pray, and real prayer meetings are less attended than almost any other meeting of the Church.

The question then arises as to what prayer is. Is it a psychological exercise? A university professor once said that he considered prayer as "picking at God." He said it was impossible to change



the mind of God whose plan was established already, and that prayer was simply a subjective exercise, having its effect upon the life of an individual. Even if it were only subjective in its effects, prayer would still be very much worth while, for it is always a prayerless life that is harsh and mean and un-Christian. Nevertheless, prayer has an objective reality, that is, it accomplishes things in the external world. Is prayer a vocal exercise? From some types of praying we have heard, we cannot help wondering whether God is not like Baal who needs to be aroused from his slumber or to be called back from a hunting or a fishing trip. No, God looketh upon the heart and though it is valuable to express our prayers, yet He knoweth our petitions before we ask. What then can we say prayer is?

### 1. Prayer is An Attitude

The Scripture says, "Think not that ye shall be heard for your much speaking," "use not vain repetition as the heathen do," and "God looketh upon the heart." From this we see that prayer is distinctly an attitude, physically, mentally and spiritually.

Elijah's physical attitude in his prayer seems to have had much to do in his praying. After his great contention with the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel, he went on up the side of the mountain to pray and "he placed his face between his knees." Fortunately for Elijah that he took such an attitude. The ground around him had been parched and cracked from a three and a half years' drought, the dwarf cedars and brambles round about him were the color of the dust, the heat rose in waves from the hillside, and though the day was drawing to a close, a hot night seemed to be promised. But there, with his face between his knees, the prophet of God prayed for rain, and then sent his servant to the top of the mountain to look for the clouds. Seven times he returned and seven times Elijah sent him to the mountain top to look. When will Christians learn that lesson, that they must shut the world out while they pray, that there are multitudes who will do the looking if only they will do the praying. The man who looks upon the conditions of his environment will become discouraged and cease praying; but the man who shuts out his environment and looks to God is encouraged by power Divine. This same lesson was taught to Noah when God shut him in. The Christian ought to learn to shut out the world and shut himself into God at any time and at any place.

The mental attitude has much to do with prayer also, for when "two or three agree on earth as to anything they shall ask of the Father, in My Name, it shall be given to them." This promise is seldom claimed because there is rarely agreement in prayer. Many inroads are made upon our thought while in prayer, and when we check up we find that we may not be thinking of the object prayed for at all. At least, if we cannot concentrate upon the object, we should agree upon the purpose, mentally. We are in a mental lethargy concerning our praying.

Because God looketh upon the heart, we know that our words need not be fluent and beautiful to prevail. Vain repetition and much speaking mean nothing. It is the condition of our hearts which counts. If we are in the relation of sonship

to God and our hearts condemn us not, we shall ask what we will and it shall be done unto us.

### 2. Prayer is An Attempt

It is one thing to have the attitude of prayer and it is another thing to attempt to pray. A passive attitude does not consist of prayer. There must be an active attempt. The purpose of that attempt is to glorify God with definite praise and petition. To simply mouth words is meaningless. Be still and know for what you ought to pray. Once having discerned this, pray, whether the prayer be vocal or silent.

This attempt to glorify God through prayer will be opposed by Satan, especially if the desire is for salvation of souls. It may seem that the black wing of discouragement has been lowered upon us to snuff out our spiritual life, but this is the time for persistence. Daniel prayed by the River Hiddekel, twenty-one days before the answer came; then Gabriel stood beside him and told him that he had started to answer his prayer on the first day that he prayed but that he had been opposed by Satan. Now if Daniel had ceased to pray the answer would have never come. Our prayer life should be a real struggle against evil, a time when we have need of the full armour of God, for we wrestle not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers and with spiritual wickedness in high places.

Against this antagonism we must make the assault on the offensive. It means a battering back of the enemy in prayer. If ease is taken, nothing will ever come of our praying. In the name of the Lord Jesus, we should rebuke the enemy in prayer.

### 3. Prayer is An Attainment

Real praying consists in a persistence until the answer comes. Sargeant York, the greatest hero of the World War, used to tell how that he and Mrs. York, after their morning petitions, would wait for the answer, that is, for the spiritual assurance that God would perform the work. Pentecost was the result of such a waiting. Persistence is also necessary in taking time and a place for prayer. Sometimes it is necessary to pull oneself away from the daily tasks and obligations of life in order to have time to pray.

Such persistence means power; power to receive an answer like Daniel, Elijah, Cornelius, and John; power to move God like Moses in the wilderness; and power to move men like Jacob after he had wrestled with the angels. Such prayer usually brings to pass what it petitions. This may be in fulfillment of a stated promise according to which the answer may be claimed. It may be with the petition, "If it be thy will," when the will of God is not known in the matter. And it may be that the petitioner will be answered as Paul was with the words, "My grace is sufficient to thee." The petitioner prevails by being right with God and by keeping in practice. He presses into the Holy of Holies where he dwells in the secret presence of the most high.

### Questions

1. How much time a day do you spend in prayer? What does this period mean to you?
2. Does prayer accomplish things in the world, or does it simply change your own feelings upon the matter?

3. Does the world need prayer? Why?  
 4. What are some of the great truths about prayer as you analyze it?

### Books for Study on Prayer

1. *Quiet Talks on Prayer*, by S. D. Gordon.  
 2. *Pray*, by Charles Ed. Locke. 3. *Preacher and Prayer*, by Bounds. 4. *Prayer and Preaching Men*, by Bounds. 5. *The Ministry of Intercession*, by Andrew Murray. 6. *How to Pray*, by R. A. Torrey. 7. *The Psychology of Prayer*, by Karl R. Staltz.

## Topic for October 18, 1931

### The Obedience, or, Authority of Prayer

Scripture—Luke 11:5-13

AN authority is one who has a superior right to command. One who was an authority said, "Ask and ye shall receive." This authority on prayer was Jesus Christ, Emmanuel, Governor, Prince of Peace, Son of God, Son of Man. He is the highest authority in the universe. But not only did He teach us to pray but He set us an example as how to pray. Long before day we find Him in the mountains surrounding Capernaum in intercession for wisdom for the selection of His disciples. On the Mount of Transfiguration the whole night was spent in prayer that He might be prepared for the death that awaited Him. Again in Gethsemane while others succumbed to sleep He fought the lonely battle in which He tasted of the cup that was soon to be drained. He not only knew the principles of prayer but He knew the joys and sorrows of the experience of prayer.

An authority is one who has lived and thought on his subject so long that he knows more about it than most men. Such an authority was Robert Babson and the late Robert Dick Wilson. We trust the statement of these men because we are assured of the knowledge behind it. Are we able in like manner to trust this authority on prayer? Is His name sufficient to assure us of the reliability of His teachings? At present we are looking for an authority on prayer. To whom then shall we look—to commercial men, to military men, to political leaders? No, we would turn to the greatest mystic and man of prayer that the world has ever seen. We would turn to the man who said, "Father, I have asked Thee thus that they might believe," who stood by the grave of Lazarus and said weeping, "Come forth," and a dead man was raised to life?

#### 1. The Authority of the One Who tells us to Ask

This mystic was the Son of God. Many times He claimed equality with God, even to the extent that the Jews were ready to stone Him for blasphemy. Nine times in the Book of John alone Jesus claims deity. This mystic was also identical with a risen Lord of Glory who said, "All authority in heaven and earth is given to me." On that authority He sent His disciples into the uttermost parts of the world. This mystic was also the captain of our salvation before whom every knee in heaven and earth must bow. To Him we have entrusted our lives how much more can we trust our prayers to Him.

A peculiar relation exists between this master

of prayer and ourselves. Primarily He is our Saviour who had broken the power of sin and has redeemed the personality. Not only is He the example for us in prayer but He is the object of our prayer. Hence in telling us to ask He is speaking only to Christians who have accepted His redemption. The price for their salvation has been paid and they alone have a right to come to God in prayer because they can claim relationship with Jesus Christ. Then, also, He is our brother, for by adoption we, too, are the sons of His Father. We are members of the household of faith. Even as He is an heir of eternal things so, also, we shall become heirs with Him? And finally, He is our friend. Hence we can say:

What a Friend we have in Jesus,  
 All our sins and griefs to bear!  
 What a privilege to carry  
 Everything to God in prayer!  
 O what peace we often forfeit,  
 O what needless pain we bear,  
 All because we do not carry  
 Everything to God in prayer.

#### 2. The Authority of the Name in which We Ask

In this name all things are promised. He said, "If ye ask anything in my name I will do it that the Father may be glorified in the Son." "If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ask what you will and it shall be done unto you." "Where two or three come together in my name there am I in the midst of them." Generally prayer should be prayed unto God the Father through the Spirit in the name of the Son. This does not mean simply the tacking of Christ's name on the end of a petition but it means asking for the sake of Christ and for Christ's glory and for the interest of His work, so that in reality the petition and the praise are Christ's own petition and praise. By the pleading of His atonement for our sins we have the right to ask for things for Christ's kingdom on earth. The second Psalm says, "This day I have begotten thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance." This is the correct order: first the birth into the kingdom of God and then the asking in His name.

A young lad once returned from camp where he had stayed with a very intimate friend. This friend remained at camp after the return of the lad and he asked the lad to get some of his valuable clothes from his mother and send them to him at the camp. Now when the boy asked for these clothes if he had asked for them in his own name, they would have been refused, but when he asked in the name of the friend who was the son of this woman, his request was granted. If in our prayers we ask in our own name our requests shall be denied. But if we ask in the name of Jesus our every petition shall be granted to us.

#### 3. The Authority of the One Praying

The man who knows how to pray has an authority over other men. He can pray any one or anything out of the way. That is, if it stands in the way of God's will. An evangelistic meeting was being held in a certain town, and just as it came to a high point of interest a circus came to town. The evangelist realizing that this would greatly hinder the work of God and the salvation of men held a short meeting for prayer in which he asked God to remove the circus or at least not to let it interfere with the meetings. That circus never opened. It took the next train out



of town and no one knew the reason why. God gave to his praying people power over other events and persons.

A man who knows how to pray also has power to move men. When Jacob wrestled with the angel and clung helplessly on till he received the blessing he was asked, "What is thy name?" "Jacob," was the answer—which means, supplanter.

"Thy name shall be no longer Jacob, but Israel, for thou hast power with God and with men." Truly from that time on Jacob was a man who moved men. He was a prince of Israel. This includes the power of praying men under conviction. There is a subtle force over the souls of men which is loosed in no other way except by prayer. Many a man has been known to voluntarily accept Christ because of another's prayers.

Power is exercised over the evil one. Through prayer it is possible to rebuke him in the name of the Lord Jesus, and praying men realize the power of Satan. Just as much, however, does prayer influence heaven. We remember Abraham interceding for the city of Sodom to prevent the manifestation of wrath against it. Some have slightly said that Abraham bargained with God like a typical Jew, but his intercession reveals a man who knew God (Genesis 18:23-33). Moses seemingly changed the mind of God in regard to the sinful Israelites who worshiped the golden calf. God said, "Stand aside, Moses, and I will destroy these people and raise up from you another people." Moses said, "Blot me out of the Book of Life, but save these people," and God hearkened unto his prayer. Looking at this from the side of Moses, it appears that God changed His mind, but viewing it from the point of a sovereign God we realize that He ordained the prayer as well as the answer.

The windows of heaven are open to the man who prays. On the shipwreck journey to Rome Paul was warned in prayer that all would be lost save the souls of those on board. Jesus tells us of the friend who had a visitor in the night and had nothing to set before him. He in turn went to his friend and received bread and gave it to the late-comer. The praying man is a mediator between God and a needy humanity. Habbakuk prayed, "Revive thy work in the midst of the years, make known thy face, and remember mercy." The rest of the chapter is taken to tell what God did in answer to that prayer. (Hab., chap. 2-3).

By the parable of the widow and the unjust judge Jesus showed us that the praying individual has heaven interfering in his behalf. The widow by her coming caused the judge to have her wrong righted. And Jesus says that God will much more hear the prayers of His children when they cry unto Him. Surely then we ought not to be weary in prayer.

### Conclusion

Fully realizing the authority delegated to him in prayer no Christian can rationally neglect his great privilege. Though one stands amazed at the power generated from the Niagara Hudson hydro-electric dynamos which run the machinery of a thousand plants in its course, how much more should he be amazed if he could see the power generated from the dynamos of prayer which has transformed the lives of millions from the time of Christ until now.

*Read books listed under last week's article.*

## Topic for October 25, 1931 The Science, or, The Art of Prayer

*Scripture—James 5:7-20*

PRAYER is the Christian's ladder by which he ascends to spiritual heights, and when a Christian takes a tumble one can easily guess the reason why. This does not mean that prayer is simply a subjective exercise. Quite the contrary in fact, for it accomplishes things in the external world and in this way it places a hedge about an individual which protects him from evil. In reality, prayer is talking to God. It may consist of praise and adoration, or of intercession and petition. There is a beautiful picture in the Book of Revelation of urns standing before the throne of God which are gradually being filled with the incense of the prayers of the saints. When the limit is reached the answer proceeds in a spiritual movement.

The only way of permanent establishment in Christian things either for an individual or for a church is through the constant practice of prayer. The first five verses of this chapter of James depict the spirit of worldliness which at various times has crept in upon the church and which will mark the latter day condition of the church. The only antidote for this spirit of worldliness is the effectual, fervent prayer of righteous men. It is impossible to be like Christ without a prayer-saturated life, for prayer brings one into the image of Christ.

Without prayer there can be no great spiritual blessings for the soul. If our earthly fathers know how to give good gifts unto us when we ask them, how much more will our Heavenly Father grant our petitions to us. Before any spiritual movement can take place Satan must be rebuked in prayer. It is almost like a checker game. We sit waiting for God to move when in reality it is our move.

### 1. The one Offering Prayer— "A Righteous Man"

The first characteristic of a successful artist of prayer is righteousness. God hears only the prayers of a righteous man. This does not mean righteousness in the sense of perfection, but it has a two-fold meaning. Primarily we must be clothed with the righteousness of Christ which is imputed to us by faith in His sacrifice for our sins. This righteousness is described in the Bible as a garment that we put on, which covers sin. The only prayer of the sinner which we know that Christ will answer is, "God be merciful to me a sinner." But once we have accepted Christ as our Saviour, then our righteousness must be personal, that is, we must submit to the sanctifying processes of the Holy Spirit. John says, "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then we have confidence toward God and whatsoever we ask we receive of Him." The man who has a heart that condemns him doesn't enjoy praying, nor does his prayer avail. Elijah when announcing to Ahab the coming draught in answer to his prayer said, "The God before whom I stand will not send rain on the earth for the space of three and one-half years." Elijah stood always in the immediate presence of God. So it is with a righteous man.

The one offering prayer has need to abide in Christ (John 15:7). This allegory presented by Christ is an analogy to the vine and the branches. The essential characteristic of the vine is that

it supports and gives life sap to the branches. The essential characteristic of the branch is that it manufactures food and bears fruit for the vine. It is a case of give all and take all. The wood must at times be pruned by the husbandman that the fruit may be luscious. Now Christ is the vine and we are the branches and God is the husbandman. At times we must submit to the pruning processes of God which remove legitimate and good wood, but wood which is unnecessary and which prevents us from bearing luscious fruit. The only way for us to abide in Christ and Christ to abide in us is through the mystic relationship of prayer. When, therefore, we see a lack in the Christian life we know that there must be a lack in prayer. And when there is a lack in our prayer life we know there will be a lack in our spiritual life.

The praying man must have the mind of the Spirit in his prayer. (Rom.8:26.) The Holy Spirit abiding in our lives will impress us when to pray, and through prayer we will learn the mind of the Spirit for our lives.

## 2. The Kind of Prayer to Offer—"The Effectual, Fervent"

When seeking an illustration for the effectual prayer, the words of Jesus, "Whatsoever things ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them and ye shall have them," come to our attention. Just as the heart's desire moves the world it moves prayer. When a man wants to succeed along one line, whether it be business, or law or religion, more than any thing else in the world then he will succeed. Desire moved Napoleon to his conquests. It moved Tennyson to express his love for Arthur Hallam through *In Memoriam*. It moved Gene Tunney to become the world's heavy weight boxing champion. Even so a sufficient desire will move an individual to pray things down from heaven.

This heart's desire must be expressed. One thinks of entering the presence of a king or an important personage with a loose tongue and careless manners. The thought is incompatible with reason. How much more should care be expressed when we enter into the presence of God. Unclear expression and mouthed words are meaningless.

This prayer is carried to God by faith. Faith is the life and power of prayer, without it our petitions would rise no higher than the carrying sound of our voice. Just as the voice of a singer without electric power would never leave the broadcasting chamber of a modern radio station, so without the power of faith the voice of one praying would never rise above its own carrying voice. It was faith that made Enoch walk with God and made Abel give a more perfect sacrifice, and made Moses choose the afflictions of the people of God rather than the pleasures of sin. That same faith is essential to prayer. Not only to carry a prayer to God but also to apprehend an answer in faith.

Our effectual prayer says, "Believe that ye have received." This means that if the answer is ever to come, if sin is not intervening, or if misunderstanding is not the cause of prayer, the answer should first be received in faith and then the material answer will come. If this spiritual answer is not received the material will never arrive. But the belief is not the experience. The actual experience of the answer may come immediately or after an interval. But the more we praise God for the answer received in faith, the sooner it will come.

## 3. The Results of such a Prayer

The earnest, believing, trusting, expectant prayer is the prayer of the whole soul, not the partial soul. Jesus told of the importunate friend who would give his friend no rest until he had received somewhat to give to the traveler in the night. Such is a picture of a fervent prayer. No obstacles or conditions prevented the accomplishment. It is a prayer that asks and if it does not receive, seeks the cause that hinders, and then if it finds the cause and it seems insurmountable it will knock until resistance is gone. These are not different phrases expressing the same idea but they are different steps in prayer—ask, seek, knock.

This believing, fervent prayer availeth much. It accomplishes things. While righteous men pray events transpire in heaven and on earth and change items of eternal interest. With this in mind men of God have taken hours for prayer. It takes time to be holy and to speak off with the Lord.

## Conclusion

Elijah was a man of like passions with ourselves and yet he prayed and it rained not on the earth for the space of three and one-half years, and then he prayed again and the rain came. What was possible for a discouraged, fallible human being is possible also with any righteous man who listens for the still small voice.

## Questions

1. What relation does personal godliness have to the power of prayer? How are we to arrive at a possession of righteousness?
2. Can you develop any further truths from the mystical relationship of the vine and the branches about prayer? What are some of the legitimate but unnecessary actions in the Christian life that we should allow God to prune away from us?
3. What relationship does faith have to prayer?
4. What passions did Elijah have which also surround the Christian life with obstacles and difficulties in prayer?

## Topic for November 1, 1931

### The Practice, or, The Act of Prayer

Scripture—I Thess. 5:14-24

PRAY without ceasing" is a command dealing with advanced religion. Those who are in the prattling stage of prayer do not know much about this. The statement is grouped with other parallel enjoiners of spiritual vitality. "Rejoice ever more," is a condition of a Christian life rarely reached. Grumbling Christians are quite prevalent. They look at conditions and not at Christ, which results in despondency. A rejoicing Christian is one who has a faith in God as the Sovereign Ruler of the universe and who believes that all things work together for good to those that love God.

"In everything give thanks," is another parallel track in this railroad leading to reality in religion. Yet we live in a most thankless generation when ingratitude even marks many Christian lives. "Quench not the Spirit" runs a bit counter to our practice of confining the work of the Spirit to channels of man-made forms. "Prove all things," rather has been taken to mean, "try anything once." "Abstain from all appearance of evil" might mean to most of us, "be good but appear as near like



the evil as possible." Thus also we see that the man who prays without ceasing is different from the average run of men.

### 1. The Cause of the Statement—"Pray Without Ceasing"

Paul says that unceasing prayer is the will of God concerning us. This is a detailed and specific statement of His will for us. Some people are seeking God's will on many matters that do not impress us as important, but in this matter we know the will of God. The purpose of God in so stating His will is to manifest to us the importance of a life of prayer. It was the testimony of both Luther and Praying Hyde that the busier they were the more they had to pray. It is not a slur upon prayer or upon God to say that prayer is a labor-saving device. The man who prays will accomplish more than one who does not. It will result in a personal humility which naturally comes with a personal intercourse with the Infinite. It also stimulates interest in others since the constantly praying individual can not keep engrossed in himself. Another important effect is that it stimulates the work of Christ in the world.

Some one objects that it is not possible to pray without ceasing, but such an objection is based on a wrong understanding of this statement. It does not mean that one is talking to God constantly but it does mean that we do not stop our habit of prayer. Now this habit of prayer ought to include a season when the soul does talk to God and when it listens to God. Then the rest of the day is spent in a spirit of prayer. One has said, "To labor is to pray." Every task of life whether in business, in the home, or in the field, if preformed as one's ministry may become a sacrament when understood to be a prayer.

They who seek the throne of grace,  
Find that throne in every place;  
If we live a life of prayer  
God is present everywhere.

The question of the possibility of unceasing prayer rests with God with whom all things are possible. Steadfastness of will and purpose can easily be given to the soul by God when they are inconceivable from the human standpoint. Paul said, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." The command is followed by a promise, "Faithful is He that calleth you and He will also do it."

### 2. The Condition of it—"The God of Peace Sanctify You Wholly"

Sanctification is the process of growing more like Christ through the transformation by the Holy Spirit between the time of regeneration and of death. During this time through an act of the will in surrendering to the power of the Spirit there is no reason why the Holy Spirit could not perform in a moment what otherwise would call for the process of years. Call this surrender what we will, it is the beginning of a vital spiritual existence for the soul. The effect of this surrender is to remove besetting sins. Sin casts a veil over the soul attempting to pray. It places a wall between the individual and God. One can attempt to pray over it, or around it, or under it, but each time he finds that the veil is still there. This sin must be removed by a surrender of it to the cleansing power of the Holy Spirit. Christians living carnal lives need to give attention to this fact. Emphasis upon

sanctification is a valuable practice for Christians.

The experience that Paul here calls wholly sanctified is the experience of victory over sin. At regeneration the Spirit takes up His abode in the heart. Sin has been pardoned and sanctification has begun. There will be times after this when sin shall gain the ascendancy and the carnal nature shall rule. This is contrary to the desire of the Christian and to God but it is the condition of many. Paul says that this old man should be crucified with Christ that sin might be destroyed. However, he never says that this sinful nature is removed from us. He does say that we should reckon this sin to be dead and should not let it reign in our mortal bodies. The conflict is always present but the issue of the conflict should be victory because the Spirit has complete charge of our lives.

The way to allow the Spirit full play is to surrender our whole personality unto Him. We received Him at conversion, now let Him receive us. As Paul says, "Be filled with the Spirit." No man shall be filled with the Spirit unless he confesses his need (1 John 1:9), and unless he lives an obedient life (Acts 5:32), with sin under control and out of the way the greatest step toward unceasing prayer has been made.

### 3. The Consequence of it—Our Preservation

The most potent force for a blameless life is a prayerful life. 1 Thess. 5:23, The man who prays is sensitive to small wrongs and hurts done to God which would otherwise be missed. He is not blameless in that he is sinless but he is blameless in that he fulfills the law of forgiveness. This righteousness deals with man's self-consciousness or his treatment of himself and fellow selves, with his body-consciousness or his relationship to the physical world and nature, and with his God consciousness through an illumined spirit.

Prayer causes watchfulness which prevents Satan from overtaking us in spiritual lethargy. In the garden Jesus told Peter to watch and pray lest he enter into temptation. Less than twelve hours later he was warming himself by the fire of the enemies of Christ and cursing Him, he slipped in the garden when he failed to pray. Prayer reveals things destined only for spiritual eyes—the secrets of God. 1 Cor. 2:9.

Most glorious truth of all! Christ is coming again and when He comes judgment of the world will take place and each of us must give account of the deeds done in the body. What an incentive to a practically holy life. Prayer is the means to the end of being found blameless in that hour.

### Conclusion

The prayerless Christian lives below his privileges and misses the greatest joy and blessing of Christianity. A monotonous existence must necessarily be his for a source of Christian living has been abandoned. God grant that we may learn to pray.

### Questions

1. What is the advantage of thinking of Christians as either carnal or spiritual, beginning or advanced, surrendered or unsundered?
2. How many different things in the Bible do we know are the will of God?
3. What is our part in sanctification?
4. What does the Bible teach about the second coming and what is the relation of prayer to it?

# Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

**The Acts of the Apostles.** By Frank E. Allen.  
The Christopher Publishing House, 1140  
Columbus Ave., Boston, Mass. \$3.50.

Having read this book in manuscript form and written a "Foreword" for it, we certainly are prepared to give it our heartiest endorsement. It is true, many worthy books have been written on the Acts of the Apostles; but there is room for a new and extensive treatment like this one. It is a good-sized volume, having 828 pages. Thus it is a veritable treatise. The work has many merits. It is truly expository; the narrative portions of the Acts are retold in a vivid way; the treatment is entirely evangelical, with no modernistic elimination of the supernatural element; the illustrations, gathered from many sources, historical, literary, classical and scientific, are truly illuminating; the general outline and the chapter outlines indicate the systematic method of the author's treatment. The introductory matter is of great value, dealing with the author, canonicity, sources, time, place and purpose of this great fifth book of the New Testament. The question, "Was it completed?" is answered by our author in the affirmative. You will be interested in the author's reasons for taking this position. All told, Mr. Allen has given us a volume that bears the marks of a scholarly and spiritual mind—the only kind of a mind that can truly interpret the Biblical book which sets forth the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and describes the founding of the church of our Lord Jesus. Sincerely do we hope that Mr. Allen's book will have a wide reading and that many souls will be edified by perusing its informing pages.

**Strange New Gospels.** By Edgar J. Goodspeed.  
The University of Chicago Press, Chicago,  
Ill. \$2.00.

Dr. Goodspeed is well known for his researches in early Christian literature; also for his translation of the New Testament and a number of other books. While he may be classed theologically among the Modernists, yet he is safer and more conservative than are many of his fellows of the same

school. We certainly believe that in the work now before us he has done creditable and useful work. A large number of truly genuine documents have been found dating back to the early years of Christianity, and these are mentioned with favor by Dr. Goodspeed. But a number of fake documents have also been circulated for which the claim of antiquity has been made. It is the latter class that our author deals with in this volume. By a process of thoroughgoing literary criticism, he proves that they are not genuine. Take, for example, what is known as the *Archko Volume*, which has had a remarkable circulation and about which we have had more than one inquiry—in this book Dr. Goodspeed has shown that it is an imposture and is without authority of any kind. The spurious documents treated by Dr. Goodspeed are the following: "The Unknown Life of Jesus Christ," "The Aquarian Gospel," "The Crucifixion of Christ," "Pilate's Court and the Archko Volume," "The Confessions of Pontius Pilate," "The Letter of Benan," "The Twenty-ninth Chapter of the Acts," and "The Letter of Jesus Christ." What we need now is a volume containing the text of all these apocryphal compositions, so that each person may read them for himself just as a matter of information.

**Seeing South America.** By John T. Faris.  
Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New  
York; also Chicago, London and Edinburgh.  
\$2.50.

A book like this one has much practical value, and at the same time affords delight and pastime. What we mean is this: the author everywhere breathes a friendly spirit toward our South American neighbors, so that his book is adapted to increase the feeling of amity that exists between us and them. For this reason we hope the book will have a wide reading in both the northern and southern hemispheres. The people of the South American countries will surely be glad to note how a friendly writer of the United States looks upon them and their institutions. The author tells his story



smoothly and tersely without being either tedious or superficial. In his introduction he reviews the remarkable story of how freedom from European rule was secured by the various South American countries. This story makes a sympathetic appeal to the people of the United States. Then the author to seek out all the various names travel in South America. "But can South America be mentioned in the same breath with Europe for satisfying scenery, infinite variety, and restful experiences?" he asks. His answer is, "Try it and see!" Well, the next best thing to going and seeing for yourself is to get and read Mr. Faris's informing volume. Note where he takes you: down the east coast, into Brazil's region of mystery, in and about Rio de Janeiro, about Buenos Aires and its neighbors, on the stretching pampa of Argentina, across the Andes to Chile, away down to Tierra del Fuego, through the heart of Bolivia, on the trail of the Incas, by way of Peru and Ecuador, and out to the Caribbean Sea through Colombia and Venezuela. Surely that is a trip that ought satisfy the most finical traveller's taste. It is refreshing to roam in great lands through the medium of a book with such a genial guide as Mr. Faris.

**WHAT Is His Name?** By John MacBeath, M.A. Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 12 Paternoster Building, London, England. 3s. 6d.

It was a happy inspiration that led the author to seek out all the various names applied to God in the Old Testament and give an exposition of them. These names are symbols of certain outstanding attributes of God, and indicate how rich He is in His own being and what fullness there is in Him for Christian experience. No wonder the Psalmist exclaimed: "In thy presence there is fullness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures forever more." Let us note these varied names as our author depicts them. The name "Jehovah" means "I am," indicating the self-existent One who is ever faithful to His covenant. "Jehovah-Jireh" means the Lord who sees and provides. "Jehovah-Ropheka" means the Lord who heals. "Jehovah-Nissi" signifies that the Lord is my banner to whom I owe my allegiance. Then there is "Jehovah-Mekadishkem," which means the Lord sanctifies. "Jehovah-Shalom" indicates that our peace is in God. "Jehovah-Rohi" is the name of the Lord as our shepherd. "Jehovah-Tsid-

kenu" conveys the idea of God as our righteousness. "Jehovah-Shammah" informs us that God is ever present with us. The author "clusters" all these sacred names in the Twenty-third Psalm, where he finds an equivalent for each of them. The selected quotations from well-known authors at the beginning of each chapter are very helpful and inspiring.

**Heathen Rage.** By Gerald Stanley Lee. Richard R. Smith, Inc., 12 East 41st Street, New York. \$2.50.

You will find this a puzzling book, brilliant, original, piquant, trying, at times provoking. You will often wonder what the author is really getting at. Are his theories practical? Will they really accomplish the reforms he claims for them? He certainly suggests a good many changes. A suggestive chapter deals with physicians, and holds that the day is coming when there will be many more doctors devoted to keeping people in good health than there will be of the disease-curing order. When he devotes a lot of space to "The Revolt of the Parsons," and selects Harry Emerson Fosdick as the model of success, one feels like rebelling. He has much to say about conversion, but he often calls it "self-conversion," and so one wonders whether there is such a thing—at least, in the realm of the Christian religion. Of course, there is a possibility of a man's changing his habits, but that is not conversion in the Christian sense of the term. Besides, we can find no statement which indicates that the Holy Spirit is needed to accomplish the real conversion of the sinner into a saint. Quite a pungent chapter of the book deals with "The Creative Lawyer," and the author certainly has some very enlightening suggestions to make to the legal profession. While the chapter is brilliant, as are those that follow it, we are not sure that we can endorse the position taken in general. The professions of the teacher and the artist also come in for a good share of the author's suggestions and pithy criticisms. Well, Mr. Lee is a unique person—no, we mean personage. To us he is not quite a Sphinx's Riddle, but he runs along that line. What does he want? What is he getting at? These are the recurring questions. We agree with his own criticism of himself in his half-facetious "Closing Introduction," wherein he says, meaning himself: "He is a regular spiritual dodger . . . now here and now



here, now nowhere and no telling which . . . between physicians and parsons . . . between parsons and lawyers, between lawyers and professors, he wobbles through his book." Now, if you want to read such a book, go to it! Even the title of the book, *Heathen Rage*, is baffling, and we wonder what it has to do with the author's central purpose—if he has such a purpose.

**Tale of a Vanished Land: Memories of Childhood in Old Russia.** By Harry E. Burroughs. Illustrated with woodcuts by Howard Simon. Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1930. Pp. 336.

From a Gentile standpoint this is a strange book; but it is typically Jewish, with its disregard for separation into chapters and its meandering style. Its author must be Jewish in spite of his name, for no Gentile could picture so accurately the life of Old Russia in a remote village community. The whole is done so vividly that the characters seem like living persons whom the reader is getting acquainted with as he goes along. Moreover, they stick in the memory almost as distinctly as old friends of bygone days. As a help in understanding Jewish characteristics and prejudices this volume has no superior. The best and the worst in the Jewish mentality are faithfully set forth, and no one can read what it has to say without profiting thereby. It is a distinct contribution to the better understanding of a part of our population intense by nature and capable of great good, but also capable of great evil if perverted and apostate. The story leaves one with a feeling that the Jews need Christ.—*H. W. M.*

**The Shining Pathway.** By Rev. Lawrence Keister, D.D. Illustrations and Introduction by John W. Ischy, M.A. Published by the author. 1930. Pp. 72.

A few years ago this author published a little book of poems entitled "Little Windows." It was a compilation of little sermons in verse. Its topics were varied, but its spirit was always the same, since it breathed an unswerving faith in God's goodness and loving care. He has now issued a larger volume of the same general sort, but distinctly superior to the first one. The lines vary in their rhythm to suit the sentiment. Thus he sings:

The words that are spoken when tempered with tears

Reach hearts that are broken, as well as dull ears;  
They search out the spirit and find where it lives,  
And draw very near it by grace that God gives.

On the opposite page he has this stanza:

As Christians we should stand apart,  
Because we live like Jesus,  
Because we shine with holy light  
For every one that sees us.

Many a sermon could be enlivened with quotations from its pages.—*H. W. M.*

## Additional Literary Notes

A very satisfying number of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, edited by Dr. Melvin G. Kyle and his associates, is the July issue. Professor John E. Wishart, D.D., J.L.D., of the San Francisco Theological Seminary, discusses "The Religion of Humanism" in a very capable and informing way. "The First Philosopher Christian" is the title of an article by our friend, Professor John A. Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary, who depicts the experience of Justin Martyr in going from one philosophy to another, only to find his mind and heart satisfied with the Christian religion. Next comes an article by Professor Leander S. Keyser, D.D., of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, on "The Practical Value of Theological Knowledge," in which he shows that a complete college and seminary course, including the Hebrew and the Greek, is of the most practical importance to the minister of the gospel.

Rev. Charles E. Edwards, D.D., contributes an article of much value on Calvin's view of infant salvation, completely exonerating the reformer from the charge that he taught that deceased infants are eternally lost; indeed, he taught the precise opposite. One of the profoundest articles in the magazine is the one on "The Necessity of the Trinity," by Rev. C. Norman Bartlett, S. T.D. Whether or not his argument is convincing at every point, he certainly shows that it is much more reasonable and satisfying to believe that the one Absolute Being is tripersonal rather than unipersonal. The very richness and fullness of the Divine Being necessitates His having more than one Ego, more than one power of self-consciousness. An infinite Person must have another infinite person as an adequate Alter-Ego. But still another infinite Person is needed to complete the circle of the eternal fellowship of altruistic love. We are also very favorably impressed with an article by Dr. Herbert W. Magoun on "Are the Geological Ages Irreconcilable with Genesis?" He takes the position that they are reconcilable.



# The Editor's Mail

## Geological-Ages Hoax Again

I would like to address a letter through you to the reviewer of *The Geological-Ages Hoax*, Mr. Byron E. Nelson, whose review appears in the columns of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE (June 1931.)

I quite appreciate his belief that he has got more real satisfaction out of Prof. Price's books than anyone else. But Mr. Nelson is not alone. I will have to share that benefit with him. Professor Price has been my mentor too. I have read all his books, and his *New Geology* is a godsend, truly so.

I too have exhausted a great deal of current geological literature in the discriminating way which Prof. Price has taught me, and find, amongst other things, that the geological ages are indeed a fallacy, a hoax. And I take great satisfaction in knowing that at least one other educated person has made an intensive study of the subject and confirmed the thesis which Prof. Price enunciates. I also have the added advantage of continually studying geological formations in place in connection with my occupation.

Mr. Nelson truly observes that the will, not the intellect, is the real basis of philosophical belief, and in my opinion, it is for this reason that geologists will not be converted wholesale. And I doubt if Prof. Price expects this. My contact with geologists leads me to believe they will carry on as formerly because they like the evolutionary explanation. They are fascinated by it, and in addition, it pleasingly evades some very nasty realities, and is very suitable for those who choose darkness to light. At the present moment I am corresponding with a most eminent American geologist. He says Prof. Price is reason-blind, a term which indicates that its user has himself a mind which is not entirely free from bias.

There will be conversions among geologists, I have no doubt. Isolated cases for the present. But in time the truth is bound to come out. But that, I believe, will be in the millennium, for which all these things appear to be a preparation. May I add that it is my

conviction that some day the remains of man, as such, will be found associated with the lowest fossils—what will the evolutionists say then?

Will Mr. Nelson let me know when and where his new book will be published, as I shall want to purchase one.

J. S. CROSSCOMBE

Howleybury, Ontario.

## Bowring's Critics

Professor Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary, replied as follows to an inquiry as to the hymn writer Bowring's doings in China:

I looked up the matter, and found exactly as you said. The statement is one of the many misrepresentations of the "Modernists," who often seem as incapable of telling historic truth as theological truth. As you say Bowring wrote *In the Cross of Christ I Glory* and other hymns in 1824, 1825, at the age of about 32 or 33. He was not in China till 1849. He was British Consul in Canton, Superintendent of Trade in China in 1849-53, Governor of Hong Kong in 1854 and British Plenipotentiary in China '54-'59 (about). Therefore he had nothing to do with the Opium War between England and China 1840-42, and the War of 1857-58, with which he was indirectly associated, had nothing whatever to do with opium.

All that stuff is made out of whole cloth of course not intentionally to defame Bowring, but on account of recklessness of "modernists" as to accuracy of their statements.

As you know, Bowring was a Unitarian of an old Unitarian family. It has to be said that Unitarians in England and America have given us some splendid hymns and poems.

As to the War (1857-8-9) which Bowring was interested in but had nothing to do in starting, see Herbert Paul, *History of Modern England*, Vol. II, pp. 66 ff. And compare it with the misrepresentation in *Things I Know in Religion*, Harpers, 1930, p. 124. The conclusion drawn from it as to Bowring thinking his religion had nothing to do with his public acts is bosh.